



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FEBRUARY MEETING, 1890.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 13th instant, at three o'clock, P. M. ; the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

The record of the January meeting was read and approved ; and the monthly list of accessions to the Library was also read.

The PRESIDENT then said : —

We are brought very near to, if we have not already reached, the date in time which will mark the completion of a century of the existence and activity of this Society, — the first in our country to lead the succession of the numerous and generally efficient and prosperous societies of like purposes in our States, cities, counties, districts, towns, and villages. An interesting question at once presents itself as to the precise date of our nativity from which we are to begin our reckoning. Usage and recognized precedents have established the rule that the life of a chartered or incorporated Society intended for perpetuity begins with its authoritative official sanction. Yet it is a well-known fact that very many schemes have been in active existence, and many associations and fellowships for a great variety of purposes have had organizations and meetings of members before charter and seal gave them incorporation. The Royal Society of London received its charter from Charles II. in 1661. But for at least a score of years previously the scholars, savants, and philosophers who asked for and obtained that charter, with seal and mace, had held their meetings and conferences, and had been gathering materials to promote in the same way the same objects which received the royal sanction. Our own now venerable and honored University — still poor and suppliant with its flood of wealth — dates its life from September, 1636, because the General Court of the Colony then recorded its purpose to plant and foster a college among the stumps in a patch of the wilderness in a new town. The Court also made a promise of

money for the object, and designated a committee to take order for it. But none the less the Memorial Statue on the Delta is inscribed, "John Harvard, Founder, 1638." This earliest and most munificent benefactor was the founder of "*Harvard College*." But the date of two years preceding fitly marks the inception of the seminary.

Following so honored a precedent, this Society might claim that this year will complete a full century of its existence. Curiously enough, the first book plate in some of its earliest volumes bears the inscription, "Established in 1790." There was then something "established," which, soon after, it was thought best to have "incorporated." Those are the premises which we have before us for fixing the year of our nativity. And what is the significance of that word "established"? It means something that is in being, not only in purpose, but in fact. The new-born infant is a reality in a household, for watching over and for nutriment, perhaps before its name is decided upon; and that name may have been adopted in the household before it has been formally conferred in a sacred rite. It is, however, noteworthy that the faithful scribes of church and parish records in the mother country and in our early colony times, while very scrupulous in entering the date of baptism, fail to give the date of birth; as if a child's life began on the day when, as the phrase is, it was "christened." About many of our own worthies in whose biography we are interested, as for instance of John Harvard, we know the date of baptism, but not of birth.

The titlepage of the first published volume of the Society reads, "Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society for the Year 1792. Vol. I." It was printed and published in that year. The edition was a small one, and soon exhausted. The volume was reprinted in 1806.

Our records satisfactorily explain to us what was meant by the words "Established in 1790." The books in which the legend was stamped were not private property, did not belong to individuals, but had passed into the ownership of associates, a fellowship formed of a few gentlemen brought intimately together to advance a common object. They were the same men who afterward sought and obtained a charter for their Society. They had been holding meetings, gathering and contributing materials for a common purpose. Later on, one

of this series of meetings was held at the house of an associate, Judge Tudor, on Jan. 24, 1791. Eight persons were present. They agreed to regard this as their "First Meeting." It was not because it was the first meeting, but because they then first gave organic form to their association by voting on "Articles for its Constitution and Government." Continuing their "Regular" and "Special" Meetings, at one of them, on Jan. 10, 1794, a Committee was directed to apply to the Legislature for a Charter. This was granted under an Act of Incorporation passed on February 19. Here again the date of baptism, so to speak, is given more definitely than the date of birth.

In any recognition, therefore, which we might see fit to make of the completion of our first Centennial, we have an alternative for choice of date. Honoring the memory of that little group of cultivated and zealous gentlemen who had found a joint attraction in intelligent historical interests and aims, we may find the origin of our Society in their meetings held in 1790; or we may date from the grant of our formal charter. It is for the members of the Society, if the matter has interest for them, and if any view should be entertained of recognizing our Centennial, to discuss and to dispose of the question.

Intimately related, because so near in date and observance, with this matter of special concern to us, is another Centennial now engaging the interest of our whole nation, that of the completion of the fourth century of the disclosure of this Continent as a New World to the people of the Old World. This Society, before it was incorporated, was alive and active enough to take a very prominent part in the celebration of the close of the third Centennial of that event. It is the generous and uniform judgment of all the original members of this Society, that Dr. Jeremy Belknap was the first to devise, and the most earnest and efficient agent in, the work of this Society. He was a pioneer in the improved modern method of historical study. He had written an approved History of New Hampshire in three volumes before his work began here. He was zealous in collecting and discriminating in the use and improvement of important papers. He accomplished very much of value in his comparatively limited life of fifty-four years. It will gratify you to know that the Publishing Committee

have in view to provide you with a volume wholly or largely occupied with Belknap Papers now in our Cabinet.

At a meeting with his associates, Dec. 23, 1791, Dr. Belknap proposed that the centenary of the discovery of America by Columbus, as of date Oct. 12, 1492, be celebrated by the Society. The members at a meeting, March 30, 1792, approved the proposition, and appointed Dr. Belknap to deliver a Public Discourse on the occasion, with his associates, Drs. Thacher and Eliot, to take part in it. The celebration accordingly took place in Brattle Street Church on Tuesday, Oct. 23, 1792,—the date being mischosen for October 21, nine days only instead of eleven being needed for adjustment of style in the calendar. I hold in my hand the original printed pamphlet of the proceedings,—itself time-stained and antique. The speaker, with some professional formality, addressed himself to his “respectable auditors,” and started from an appropriate Scripture-text about the running to and fro through the earth, and the promised increase of knowledge or science. The address well befitted the occasion,—the materials which in more recent years have illustrated and enriched the subject, dealing with controverted details, not then being at hand. It rehearsed with sympathy and dignity the personal experience and qualities and the troubled career of Columbus, and assigned to him the unqualified renown of first opening communication between the ocean-parted continents. An appended dissertation to the Address disposed of the pretensions set up for Martin Behaim as having preceded Columbus by eight years. Only a passing reference was made to an alleged visit of “Normans to Vinland,” centuries before. After the exercises in the church, the Society dined at the house of its President, Governor Sullivan. In a course of public lectures by the Society in the Athenæum in 1833, Mr. A. H. Everett delivered one on the Life of Columbus.

The approach of the fourth Centennial of the signal event finds our citizens discussing three leading questions: (1) Whether the event shall be adequately recognized and celebrated? (2) Where the locality or central site for such celebration shall be? (3) What shall be the manner and method of it?

The first question has needed no discussion, the general assumption being that the event must be duly recognized.

The answer to the second query, as to place, has been found largely to depend for its decision upon the disposal of the third query, as to method and concomitants. The alternative to be settled is, as tersely put by our associate General Walker, in his admirable article in the "Forum" for this month, whether we wish to have a "Peddlers' Fair," or an august and dignified observance at our National Capital, on a continental scale, with munificent and lavish outlay, for grandeur and ceremonial, from our public treasury.

The date of the event comes midway between the centennial of the formation of this Society and that of its incorporation. This fact may be entertained by us in considering the question of our own recognition of either incident.

I do not propose that any action shall be taken by the Society at this time, and make these suggestions now that the matter may be considered at our next meeting.

Mr. CHARLES C. SMITH said that among the Belknap Papers referred to by the President is a letter from John Pintard, Secretary of the Tammany Society, of New York, written in 1791, in which it is stated that that Society proposes to celebrate the completion of the third century since the discovery of America by a procession and an oration; and the writer asks for the dimensions and cost of the monument on Beacon Hill, with a view to the erection in New York of a column to the memory of Columbus.

The Committee to examine the Library and Cabinet, which was authorized to make certain alterations and improvements, submitted the following report:—

The Committee on the Library would report that soon after the meeting of the Society in June last it obtained from Mr. Harris a plan for stacks or cases, and has had six made according to the pattern, and placed in the Library-room above.

It has had a large stack for pamphlets placed in the pamphlet-room, and a series of bins in the room reserved for storing the publications of the Society.

It has had a new staircase built connecting the second and third stories above this, so that access can be obtained to the upper story without passing through the entry, thus making it possible at some time to convert the landings into rooms.

A portion of the cases in the upper room have been cut down, thus giving wall space for hanging the portraits belonging to the Society ; and most of those formerly on the stairway have been transferred there.

The walls and ceiling of this room have been painted, the color of the walls being such as to furnish a good background for the portraits.

The cost of all this work has been \$691.17, — not quite two thirds of what the Committee was authorized to expend.

Places have been found for the books removed in making these changes in the new stacks, which will also accommodate the probable accessions of the next year or two, when additional stacks must be provided, unless the weeding-out process shall by that time be decided upon.

The suggestions made by the Committee in regard to binding the newspapers have not been carried out, as the work is more than can be done in the remainder of the year. The Committee would refer this subject to the consideration of the Committee which is to succeed it.

Now that the pictures have been removed, the walls of the staircase ought to be repainted ; but the Committee thought it not really a part of its duty to have this done.

The Committee has not done all it proposed to the Society, but thinks best to make this report to-day and ask to be discharged, because by the By-Laws a new committee is to be appointed at the next meeting of the Society, to which committee what has been left unfinished may well be referred.

The Committee feels that the thanks of the Society are especially due to our associate Mr. Harris for his labors to facilitate and expedite its work.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee,

HENRY F. JENKS, *Chairman.*

The report was unanimously accepted.

Communications from the Third Section having been called for, Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, Jr., said : —

For the convenience of committees of this Society who may hereafter be called upon to edit papers of the Colonial period, and for the information of any other persons who may be interested in the subject, I desire to communicate a list of about

four hundred manuscripts which, with my father's consent, I have separated from the main body of his collection of Winthrop Papers, and have given to certain libraries hereinafter named, on the ground that the local interest attaching to them renders it desirable that they should find their permanent resting-places elsewhere than in Boston. The greater part of these manuscripts have been given to the State of Connecticut for its archives, to be preserved in the State Library at Hartford, and consist largely of official papers, of varying degrees of importance, which were accumulated by John Winthrop, Jr., and Fitz-John Winthrop during their long terms of office as Governors of Connecticut.

I am aware that an idea prevails, in many quarters, that when a Society or an individual has come into possession of a mass of miscellaneous original material for history, it should be kept intact at all hazards; but, to my mind, a much broader view to take is to consider how far it may be appropriate, in the interest of historical research, to transfer portions of such material to institutions immediately connected with the subjects to which they relate. In other words, the duty of providing the various classes of historical manuscripts with the fittest, the safest, and the most convenient permanent homes ought, in my judgment, to be paramount to any selfish considerations. For instance, I have never been disposed to echo the lamentations which pervaded this building when the State of Massachusetts finally obliged us to surrender the Hutchinson Papers so long in our keeping. I incline to believe the State had the better claim to them, and I think they are appropriately quartered in the State House. Nor should I have shed many tears if Connecticut had similarly succeeded in recovering for its archives some of the papers given us, in 1794, by the heirs of Governor Trumbull.

It must not be supposed, however, that the scattering subtractions I have made from the main body of my father's collection in any way impair the interest and value of those sequences of public and private correspondence which it would not be wise to disturb, and upon which successive committees of this Society have labored, at intervals, for at least half a century, and seem likely to labor, at similar intervals, for at least half a century to come. On the contrary, the removal of many miscellaneous papers of local interest tends to facil-

itate a much needed rearrangement of the correspondence, a good deal of which is not in its proper order.

It is not improbable that some further selections will one day go to Connecticut or elsewhere; but in view of the delay and uncertainty attending such a disposition, I have thought it convenient to communicate what has thus far been accomplished, as the lists, when printed, may be useful to students. They are made out, so far as practicable, in chronological order; and where the word "copy" occurs, an ancient copy is invariably meant, although not always one of the same year as the original.¹

Given to the State Library of Connecticut, at Hartford.

163 $\frac{1}{2}$, March 19. The old patent of Connecticut, or Warwick grant. Copy, indorsed by John Winthrop, Jr.

1647, July -. Testimony of three Niantick Indians that Sassacus had granted his country to John Winthrop, Jr., before the Pequot War. See Plym. Col. Rec., vol. ix. p. 103.

1647, Oct. 27. Commission of Edward Hopkins, Governor of Connecticut, to John Winthrop, Jr., to be magistrate at Nameocke (New London). It is in the handwriting of Hopkins, and has on it the oldest known impression of the seal of Connecticut Colony. Winthrop was then a Massachusetts Assistant, as he had been since 1631, and as he continued to be till 1650. This Commission was given him in order that he might exercise authority at New London, Massachusetts having relinquished her claim to the Pequot country. He did not become a freeman of Connecticut till 1650.

1650, Nov. 15. George Chappell's acknowledgment of indebtedness to Thomas Sweetman.

1651, Nov. 18. Agreement between Pequot townsmen and Cassasina-mon, *alias* Robin, Chief of the Nameaug Indians.

1651-1665. Copies of grants of land at New London to John Winthrop, Jr. Eight pieces.

1652, Dec. 22. Agreement of New London with John Elderkin about a meeting-house.

1653, April 23. Depositions about certain grants of land in New London.

1653, June 17. Indenture of Henry Sawmon as apprentice to John Chester.

¹ In assigning dates to copies, it has been thought preferable to give the date, or probable date, of the original document.

1653, August 2. Paper relating to case of Edward Hull and Kempe Sybada, tried in Rhode Island.

1653, Nov. 2. Original deed of Pawtuxett, by James, Sachem of Quinebaug, to John Winthrop, Jr.

1654, Oct. 16. Names of captive Pequots who consent to remove.

1654, Oct. 24. Order of Committee of Commissioners of the United Colonies, about settling Pequots, etc.

1655, May 22. Richard Harvie, and others, to John Winthrop, Jr., about iron ore at Stratford.

1655, Sept. 15. Royal Commissioners to Magistrates of Rhode Island, about Narragansett. Copy.

1655, Nov. 29. Copy of New Haven town-record about the Iron-Works.

1657, Jan. 1. Instructions of Connecticut Magistrates to John Gilbert and John Griffin, with regard to Uncas. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. i. p. 307; and Plym. Col. Rec., vol. x. p. 196.

1658, May 26. Return of John Gilbert and others, sent to Farmington to inquire why Indians passed through Hartford bounds in a hostile manner.

1658, August 19. Original deed of Massapeag, by Uncas, Sachem of the Mohegans, to Richard Haughton.

1658, Oct. 19. Massachusetts grant to Southertown (Stonington). Copy attested by Secretary Willard.

1658. Copies of deeds to Robert Park, of New London. Three pieces.

1658-1659. Unsigned paper, in the handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr., relative to interpretation of an order of the Commissioners of the United Colonies about Mistick.

1659, Feb. 23. Copy of the order of the General Court of Connecticut with reference to the bargain with Mr. Fenwick. This, though a certified copy, varies somewhat from the record.

1659, March 2. Copy of a survey of Southertown (Stonington).

1659, April 28. Copy of a deed of Allumps and Haquountouses (Indians), of land at Quinebaug.

1659, May 14. Original deed of Allumps and Aguntus, granting Quinabaug lands to John Winthrop, Jr., John Endicott, and Amos Richardson. On parchment, torn.

1659, Sept. 12. Original deed of Waweequa, brother of Uncas, to John Winthrop, Jr., of a mine in the Shetucket country.

1659, Dec. 12. Saybrook men to Governor and Magistrates of Connecticut. Greater part of the Church and some of the Town, with Minister, are removing. They (the signers) intend to stay.

1660, May 5. Draft, in handwriting of Secretary Clark, releasing

Capt. John Cullick from restraint. A similar draft, unsigned. Two pieces.

1660, May 7. Draft of letter from John Winthrop, Jr., to Nathaniel Willet, to let fall his action against Captain Cullick. This paper and the preceding one have reference to the purchase from Fenwick.

1660, Sept. 14. Commissioners' letter about Mr. Sylvester and his island.

1660, Sept. 29. Copy of the Narragansett Mortgage. Handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr.

1660. Copy of a complaint by Englishmen at Nameaug against Uncas.

No date. Paper, in handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr., about jurisdiction over Pequot lands, and about union of Connecticut and New Haven.

No date. Pleas to the Commissioners about Mistick. Handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr.

No date. Argument as to Connecticut's title to Mistick. Handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr.

No date. Intended order of the Commissioners about Southertown (Stonington). On the back, copy of part of a letter from General Court of Rhode Island.

No date. Paper indorsed by John Winthrop, Jr.: "Names of the Pequots taken by Major Mason and myself at Pakatuck."

166½, Jan. 14. Nathan Gold and others, of Fairfield, to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about taxes.

166½, Feb. 4. Copy of a deed of land at Nawayunk (Noank), from Robin and other Pequots, to William Thompson.

166½, Feb. 14. Result of the consultation of Magistrates and Deputies, about addressing King Charles II. Handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr.

166½, March 14. Order for proclaiming King Charles II. in Connecticut.

1661, May 6. Certain inhabitants of Fairfield to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about Indian land between Fairfield and Stratford.

[1661, May -?] Petition of John Stebbins, of New London, to General Court of Connecticut for remission of payment of money.

1661, June -. Attestation of Magistrates that John Talcott is Treasurer of Connecticut, etc.

1661. Letter of credit for £500, in favor of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., Agent of Connecticut in London, signed by Treasurer Talcott.

166½, Feb. 26. Order for the appearance of Col. Thomas Temple and Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., before the Privy Council in London, with reference to the Connecticut Charter.

1662, May 3. Draft of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., on Treasurer Talcott, for expenses relating to Charter, etc. Copy.

1662, May 3. Agreement of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., for 2,000 bushels of wheat, at 3s. 6d. per bushel, and 1,200 bushels of pease, at 2s. 6d. per bushel, to be delivered by Treasurer Talcott to Messrs. Cowes, Maskelyne, & Sylvester, merchants of London, in repayment of cash advanced by them.

1662, May 8. Deposition of John Stebbins, of New London, as to words spoken by Goody Waterhouse.

1662, Oct. 13. Gov. Peter Stuyvesant to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr. Copy. See N. Y. Col. Docs.

1662, Oct. 13. Copy of Summons to inhabitants of Westchester, New York, to send deputies to General Court at Hartford in May following.

1662, Oct. 15. Copy of Secretary Clark's letter to Governor Stuyvesant, thanking him for attentions to Governor Winthrop, etc.

1662, Oct. 27. Copy of John Young's letter to Sergeant Hubbard; notification of claim of Connecticut to jurisdiction over Long Island.

1662. Copies of depositions about Goodwife Waterhouse's treasonable speech.

1662. Draft of letter sent by Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., to certain gentlemen of New Haven. See New Haven Col. Rec., vol. ii. pp. 522, 523, from which it varies.

1662? Draft of acquittance for ——— Goodwin's legacy.

1662-3. Copy of declaration by Commissioners of Connecticut, claiming jurisdiction over Long Island.

1663, Jan. 4. Temporary agreement of John Scott and John Young with Secretary Van Ruyven, etc., as to status of English and Dutch in sundry towns.

1663, Feb. -. Instructions to deputies to Connecticut General Court from Crafford (Jamaica); desire to unite with Connecticut if other Long Island towns do.

1663, July -. Docket, as to granting Rhode Island Charter.

1663, Sept. 3. Testimony about oath of William Wells, of Southold.

1663, Sept. 9. Return of committee of Commissioners of the United Colonies, concerning lands claimed by Pequots, and by Uncas. Copy by Secretary Kimberly.

1663? Copy, in handwriting of Daniel Clark, of undirected letter about Address to the King.

1664, April 26. Copy of the commission to Col. Richard Nicolls et al. for settling differences in New England.

1664, May 1. Paper relating to the preference of the inhabitants of Newark (Flushing) to remain under the Dutch.

1664, June 14. Paper relating to the appointment of deputies from Oyster Bay to Hempstead, and elsewhere; to vindicate their lawful liberties against any pretended jurisdiction over them.

1664, June 17. Paper relating to desire of the inhabitants of Flushing to abide by the agreement between Governor Stuyvesant and John Scott.

1664, July 16. Richard Smith to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about interference of Rhode Island men at Narragansett.

1664, Sept. 24. Copy of Colonel Cartwright's agreement with Mohawks and Senecas.

1664, Oct. 14. Petition of William Cheesbrough to General Court of Connecticut, as to Stonington bounds.

1664? Copy of the petition of Anne Phillips to Governor Nicolls, of New York, concerning a fine laid on her son by Connecticut.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, Jan. 28. Copy of letter from King Charles II. to Colonel Nicolls; precautions against the Dutch.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, Feb. 1. Secretary Allyn to William Jones; arms of soldiers in New Haven, Guilford, etc., to be viewed, there being a reported gathering of Indians at Albany.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, March 17. Deed of Robert Burrows to Edward Culver. Original and copy. Two pieces.

1665, July 15. Draft of letter from General Court of Connecticut to Governor Nicolls of New York, apologizing for not affording aid.

1665, Sept. 15. Royal Commissioners to Rhode Island magistrates, about Narragansett. Copy.

1665. Draft of Address of Connecticut General Assembly to the King.

1666, June 13. Jonas Houldsworth to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr.; claim of Deborah Scott transferred to John Cooper.

1666, August 28. King Charles II. to Governor and Council of Connecticut about war with French and Dutch.

1666, Oct. 2. Deposition of Thwayt Strickland and wife, about Rhode Island boundary.

1666, Nov. 16. Copy of a Coroner's verdict: death of child of Samuel Browne.

1666, Nov. 23. Copies of lay-out of land in Stonington.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, March -. Remonstrance of Milford against paying Mr. Rossiter.

1667, April 1. Order of Council of Connecticut for precautions against small-pox.

1668, Sept. 19. Propositions made by Maqua Indians at Albany. Copy.

1668-1704. Copies of New London town votes. Three pieces.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, Jan. 21. Letter of Middletown Church to Rev. Samuel Stow.

1669, May 5. Petition of Cassasinomon to Connecticut General Court.

1669. Testimony of an Indian about land given to Jeremy Adams.

No date. Draft, or copy, of a letter to Massachusetts Commissioners, about a misunderstanding, not specified.

No date. Agreement with Indians at Quaquetauge. Copy.

1670, May 9. John Lay, senior and junior, to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about a justice for Lyme.

1670, June 21. Copy of a letter from John Allyn et al. to Samuel Wilson, as to molestation of Connecticut men by Rhode Islanders in Narragansett country.

1670? Petition of Cassasinomon for land.

1671 $\frac{1}{2}$, Jan. 3. Secretary Allyn to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about a special Court of Assistants.

1672, March 26. Petition of Narragansett men to Connecticut General Court for protection.

1672, Oct. 8. Secretary Rawson to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about land in Stonington held under Massachusetts grants.

1673, May 8. Copy of lay-out of eastern bounds of Stonington.

1673, August 7. Southampton, L. I., asks advice of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr. ; Dutch have taken New York.

1673, August 7. Southampton, L. I., asks advice of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., about Dutch summons to surrender.

1673, August 7. Easthampton, L. I., asks advice of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., or the Council at Hartford, concerning the Dutch invasion.

1673, August 7. W. Rider to ———, asking advice about surrender of Setauk to the Dutch.

1673, August 15. Deputies of five towns on east end of Long Island thank Connecticut for care, etc., but have been compelled to submit to Dutch ; ask liberty of egress and regress, as formerly. Two copies.

1673, August 29. Copy of Southampton's declaration that she has been compelled to submit to the Dutch.

1673, August 29. Copy of a letter from Southampton to the Governor of Massachusetts. It has been wet, and is difficult to decipher.

1673, Oct. 20. Henry Pierson, Thomas James, and others inform Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., that a Dutch attack is imminent, and ask for aid.

1673, Oct. 30. Address of Southampton, Southold, and Easthampton, to Governor and Council, or General Assembly, of Connecticut, asking that Capt. Fitz-John Winthrop may be sent as Major in command of the three plantations for their joint defence.

1673, Oct. 30. Southampton and Easthampton to Samuel Willis and Fitz-John Winthrop, asking authority to prevent mutiny and disorder.

1673, Dec. 4. Southampton to Fitz-John Winthrop, about need of ammunition.

1673, Dec. 9. Fitz-John Winthrop's certificate that he had pressed several men as soldiers.

1673, ——. Certain men of the new Church at Windsor complain against the old Church.

No date. Copy of agreement between a Dutch captain and John Clark.

1674, April 10. Copy of order from Council of Connecticut releasing soldiers on Long Island on arrival of Massachusetts ships.

1674, April 16. John Howell and others, of Southold, communicate to Governor and Council of Connecticut their satisfaction with the course pursued by Major Fitz-John Winthrop.

1674, Oct. 30. Southampton asks advice of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., or his Council, on learning the reported arrival of Governor Andros at New York.

1674, Nov. 1. Agreement between Fitz-John Winthrop and John Lamb, of New London, about Mystic Mill.

1675, May 27. Settlement of line between Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., and W. Parks at Quaquabag.

1675, Sept. 8. Fitz-John Winthrop's warrant to press a horse, on his way to Hartford.

1679, May 6. Original deed (of land at Stonington?) by Cattapesett to Mrs. Anna Stanton. It is witnessed by "Wonkow, gentleman," and by "Mugwomp."

1680, March 29. Governor Andros to Fitz-John Winthrop, about a wreck on Fisher's Island.

1681, May 18. Treaty of Uncas with Connecticut. Original, and copy of counterpart. Two pieces. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. iii. p. 309.

1683, May 10. Copy by Secretary Allyn about Mohegan East bounds.

1683, Oct. 20. Copy of the report to the King about Narragansett, by Edward Cranfield and others.

1683, Nov. 20. Townsmen of New London to Rev. Increase Mather, about a minister.

1683, Nov. 28. Articles of agreement between Governor Dongan of New York, and Governor Treat of Connecticut. Copy.

1684, July 5. Copy of an Act about Pirates, with a memorandum of the Sheriff of Fairfield County that it had been proclaimed.

1684, ——. Copy of several records concerning Mohegan bounds.

1685, August 3. Agreement of New London about Rev. Thomas Barnerd for minister.

1686, May 7. Deed by James Fitch, Jr., of Norwich, to William Stoughton, Samuel Shrimpton, and Wait Winthrop, of a large tract of land in the northern part of Windham County, Connecticut. Indenture on parchment.

1686, May 10. Original deed, on parchment, of part of the Nipmuck, and the whole of the Wabaquasset country, by Owaneco and Josiah to William Stoughton, Samuel Shrimpton, and Wait Winthrop. See Col. Rec. Deeds, vol. ii. pp. 195-197.

1688, Feb. 14. *Dedimus* of Sir E. Andros to Walter Clark, Fitz-John Winthrop, and John Coggeshall, to administer oath of allegiance to inhabitants of Rhode Island, King's Province, etc.

1687, April 6. Roll of military company at Feversham (Westerly), R. I.; Stonington names.

1688? Copy of a petition to Deputy-Governor Nicholson, of Massachusetts, about Narragansett.

1690, June 30. Blank commission of Ensign, in Connecticut service, with seal.

1690, July 11. A commission similar to preceding, for service against French and Indians.

1690, July 25. Commission of Daniel Wetherell to be captain of New London train-band.

1690, Sept. 4. Substance of propositions made at Albany by Sachems of the Five Nations.

1691, May 27. Secretary Allyn to Fitz-John Winthrop and Daniel Wetherell, about pirates.

1692, Sept. 16. Address of Freeholders of Connecticut to their Majesties. See N. Y. Col. Docs., vol. iii. p. 849.

1692. Memorandum about Quinabaug bounds.

1693? Queries about Connecticut Charter, command of militia, etc.

1693. Copy of Acts of New York and New England Commissioners.

1693, Sept. 28. Acknowledgment from the authorities of Hampshire County, Massachusetts, of assistance rendered by Connecticut.

1693, Oct. —. "Theses to be debated with his Exc. at New York," as to aid in defence of New York. Handwriting of William Pitkin.

1693, Oct. 28. Account of Caleb Stanley, Commissary, of charges borne by Connecticut in war against French and Indians. Two pieces.

1693, Oct. —. Copies of correspondence with Governor Fletcher, of New York, about command of Connecticut militia. All but one of these are printed in Conn. Col. Rec., vol. iv. pp. 111-115.

1693. Drafts of answers to Governor Fletcher's claim to command Connecticut militia. Three sheets.

1693, Nov. 16. Agreement of sundry persons with Fitz-John and Wait Winthrop, as to settlements at Quinabaug.

1693, Jan. —. Copy of a petition from Gershom Bulkeley, and others, to Governor Fletcher, of New York, acknowledging him as Commander-in-chief

1694, Oct. 19. Governor Treat to Lords Commissioners of Trade; observations about Acts of Trade, etc.

1695. Attorney-General Sir Thomas Trevor to Lords Commissioners of Trade; opinion as to Narragansett. Copy.

1695? Petition to the King by Fitz-John Winthrop, Agent of Connecticut, about arms and ammunition.

1695, Oct. 25. Draft of Address to the King for supply of ammunition.

1696, March 30. William Cowper's opinion on Governor Fletcher's claim.

1696, April - Oct. Copies of correspondence with Governor Fletcher about aid to New York. Ten pages.

1696, Oct. 8. Address of Connecticut Assembly to King William on discovery of a plot to assassinate him.

1696, Oct. 28. William Popple, Secretary of Board of Trade, to Fitz-John Winthrop; asks for copy of Connecticut Charter.

1696, Dec. 12. Same to same; returns copy of Charter, and alludes to Governor Fletcher's complaints.

1697, April 13. Draft of memorial to Lords Commissioners of Trade, about command of militia.

1697, April 23. William Popple to Fitz-John Winthrop, enclosing copy of Duchess of Hamilton's petition.

1697, April or May. Council of Connecticut to Lord Bellomont, congratulating him on his arrival. Copy.

1697, May. Copy of petition of Z. Roberts on behalf of Bedford (now in New York).

1697, July 22. Orders and Instructions from England, to be observed by Governor of Connecticut, respecting Trade. Ten pages.

1697, Sept. 21. Copy of letter from Board of Trade to Lord Bellomont, about revolt of Rye and Bedford to Connecticut.

1697, Oct. 8. Complaint of settlers of Quinabaug to Wait Winthrop that they cannot get a minister, etc., on account of Fitch and Tracy, who monopolize land.

1697. Copy of Sir Francis Pemberton's opinion on the Duke of Hamilton's claim.

1697. Copy of John Post's testimony about Mohegan bounds.

1697. Copy of Act of Rhode Island forbidding settlement in Narragansett.

1697? Account of charges expended by Connecticut in defence of New York since 1688.

1698, Jan. 27. Copy of letter from General Assembly of Connecticut to Duke of Shrewsbury, about observance of Laws of Trade.

1698. Duplicate of letter from Governor and Council of Connecticut to the Lords Commissioners of Trade.

1698, March 21. Complaints of settlers of Quinabaug to Fitz-John Winthrop about Fitch and Tracy.

1698, April. List of vessels registered at the port of New Haven. Seven pages.

1698, June 13. Copy of unsigned letter to Secretary Allyn, desiring copies of records.

1698, June 17. Instructions to Connecticut Commissioners appointed to treat with Lord Bellomont about boundary lines.

1698, June 17. Private instructions to the same on the same subject.

Probably same date. A paper unsigned and undated, but in handwriting of Robert Treat, on the same subject.

1698, June 28. Samuel Mason to Fitz-John Winthrop, about Connecticut and Rhode Island bounds.

1698, June 29. Memorial of Connecticut Commissioners to those of Rhode Island, about boundaries.

1698, June 30. Reply of Connecticut Commissioners to those of Rhode Island.

1698, June 30. Letter from Connecticut Commissioners to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop, reporting their proceedings.

1698, July 26. Commission of Daniel Wetherell to be Judge of New London County Court.

1698, July 27. Copy of Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop's proclamation to Judges, etc., about suppression of vice.

1698, August 9. Draft of Daniel Taylor's commission to be naval officer at Saybrook.

1698, August 17. Copy of Hue and Cry for apprehension of deserters, issued by Lord Bellomont, and endorsed by Fitz-John Winthrop.

1698, Oct. 13. Petition of ministers of Fairfield County to General Court of Connecticut, about their support.

1698, October 26. B. Fayerweather's bond as gauger, deputy-surveyor, and excise-man in Fairfield County.

1698, Nov. 30. Copy of Owaneco's protest, set on sign-post at Windham, about land claimed by him and by Abimeleck.

1698, Dec. 8. Proposals of Samuel Mason et al. to Rhode Island Commissioners, about boundaries.

1698? Copy of a declaration of Daniel Clark and Samuel Willis against James Fitch.

1698, Jan. 21. Proclamation of Governor and Council of Connecticut prohibiting entry on lands claimed by Owaneco and Abimeleck.

1698. Copy of R. Fenton's declaration about counterfeiting.

1699, March 31. Summons for witnesses against pirates.

1699, March 31. Copy of the examination of John Pierce, Thomas Edgehill, Edward Plumbe, and John Parrott, about pirates.

1699, April 3. Memorandum of cash taken from pirates.

1699, April 3. Proclamation of Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about pirates.

1699, April 13. A second proclamation on the same subject.

1699, April 26. Complaint of Haddam men to Governor and Council of Connecticut.

1699, May 9. Proclamation of Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about Scotch Darien Expedition.

1699, May 29. Summons to Elisha Cheesbrough about money of pirates.

1699, May 30. Complaint of Lieut. Thomas Clark and Ensign John Arnold concerning Serjeant Spencer's behavior.

1699, May? Bill for incorporating Quinebaug by the name of Kent. Handwriting of Major James Fitch.

1699, July 14. Earl of Jersey to Governor and Council of Connecticut about pirates.

1699, July 17. Summons to Edward Allen about money of pirates.

1699, August 18. Copy of warrant to B. Fayerweather of Fairfield to search for goods brought from on board Captain Kid.

1699, Sept. 18. Copy of protest by Selectmen of Stonington against Owaneco's encroachments.

1699, Sept. 30. Thomas Gullock to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop; thanks for securing pirates.

1699, Oct. 3. Copy of survey of Quinabaug.

1699, Oct. 11. Testimony of Joseph Arnold and others as to Serjeant Spencer's mutinous conduct.

1699, Oct. 15. Draft of letter to Lords Commissioners of Trade, in handwriting of Gurdon Saltonstall.

1699, Oct. 22. Draft of letter from Governor and Council of Connecticut to Lords Commissioners of Trade.

1699? Oct. Copy of Address to the King about admitting appeals from Connecticut Courts.

1699. Capt. Thomas Gullock protests to Governor and Council of Connecticut that the pirates who robbed him of the ship Adventure, and who are now in New London gaol, should not be so well treated.

1699, Nov. 4. Captain Gullock's receipt for £620. 15, recovered from pirates.

1699, Nov. 7. Captain Gullock's order for delivery of a horse.

1699, Dec. 14. Draft of a letter from Council of Connecticut about Narragansett.

1699, Dec. 20. Petition of Joseph Pemberton et al. to Lord Bello-mont, about Narragansett.

1699, Dec. Bill of Sheriff Prentts for support of pirate prisoners, £124. 13.

1699. Another bill of Sheriff Prentts for the same object, £10. 3. 6.

1699? A petition from pirates confined in New London gaol, unsigned.

1788, Jan. 18. Copy of Owaneco's deed of land in Quinabang to Thomas Williams.

1788, Jan. 22. Copy of Owaneco's information to Governor and Council of Connecticut of a league of Indians against the English.

1788, Feb. 19. Summons to John Hallam and S. Allen to answer about harboring pirates.

1788, Feb. 20. Extract of letter from Lieutenant-Governor of New York to Lord Bellomont about pirates.

1788, Feb. 23. Summons to Nathaniel Niles and Daniel Reed to answer about money and goods of pirates.

1788, Feb. 24. Letter from Selectmen of Stonington about town-recorder.

1788, Feb. 26. Copy of a warrant from Governor and Council of Connecticut about a wreck at Fisher's Island.

1788, March 18. Account of what the Indians have received of James Corbin, supposed to relate to purchase of land in Windham County.

1700, June 25. Instructions from the Commissioners of Customs as to issue of Algerine passes.

1700, July 18. Daniel Wetherell to Andrew Belcher about a bill on London for Connecticut Council.

1700, July 29. Letter from John Tracy to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about scouts.

1700, Oct. 7. Copy of message and proposal of the Onnagongue Indians to the Five Nations.

1700, Jan. 18. Commissioners of the Treasury to Connecticut Collector about Algerine passes.

1700, March 4. Mr. Secretary Vernon to Governor and Council of Connecticut notifying them of fitting out of a French squadron.

1700, March 21. Instructions to Richard Edwards in case of George Denison at Rhode Island.

1701, April 22. Council of New York to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about deserters. Two pieces.

1701, July 18. Writ of Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop to arrest trespassers at Plainfield.

1701, Dec. 18. Order of Privy Council with regard to appeals from Colonial Courts of Admiralty.

1701. Copy of proposed Act for re-uniting to the Crown the government of several New England colonies.

1701. Copy of Sir H. Ashurst's memorial about Narragansett.

1701? Heads of articles against the Governor and Company of Connecticut.

1701, March 19. Unsigned petition of Pequot Indians to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop for a sachem.

1702, March 27. Deputy-Governor Treat and Council of Connecticut to Lieutenant-Governor Nanfan, of New York, urging delay in the execution of Colonel Bayard.

1702, April 2. Bond for appearance of J. Rayner (supposed pirate) before Governor and Council of Connecticut.

1702, April 16. Daniel Wetherell to Secretary Addington of Massachusetts about running boundary lines.

1702, July 20. Daniel Taylor and John Clark to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about shot for Saybrook Fort.

1702, July 29. Record of Connecticut Council meeting at Saybrook; King's death, Massachusetts boundary line, etc.

170 $\frac{2}{3}$, Feb. 20. Complaint of Thomas Richards to Council of Connecticut about a fugitive slave.

170 $\frac{2}{3}$, Feb. 24. Record of Connecticut Council meeting at Saybrook; letters from England, orders for defence, etc. Two pieces.

170 $\frac{2}{3}$. Secretary Kimberly to Gov. Joseph Dudley about boundaries.

170 $\frac{2}{3}$, March 20. Secretary Addington to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about a convoy.

1703, April 6. Return from Lyme of ammunition on hand.

1703, May 8. Warrant to impress seven Greenwich men as soldiers.

1703, May 26. Copy of Massachusetts Act about boundary, attested by Secretary Addington.

1703, May 28. Robert Treat's testimony about Mohegan bounds.

1703, August 28. Names of Potatuck, Wyantenuck, and New Haven Indians.

No date. Names of Paquannuck and Derby Indians.

1703, August 31. Instructions to Capt. James Avery about scouting.

1703, Sept. 24. Order for Owaneco et al. to appear before Connecticut General Court in explanation of any wrongs alleged to have been done them.

1703, Sept. 27. Copy of commission as lieutenant to Manasseh Minor, of New London.

1703, Oct. 29. General Assembly of Rhode Island to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about Indians taken by their scouts.

1703, Nov. 7. Letter from Josiah Rosseter et al. to Robert Treat about representations to be made in England on behalf of Connecticut. See 6 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. iii. pp. 162, 163.

1703, Dec. 17. Order of Privy Council as to appeal of Edward Palmes.

1703. Petition of Colchester to have a military officer, etc.

1703-4? Return from Stamford of ammunition on hand.

170 $\frac{3}{4}$, March 3. Assistants at Hartford to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about sending Indians against the enemy.

1704, April 3. Major Burr's return of sixteen men impressed as soldiers in Fairfield County.

1704, April 4. Instructions to Capt. James Avery to go to Dunstable, etc.

1704, April 17. Nathaniel Stanley to Fitz-John Winthrop proposing expedition against Canada.

1704, April 24. Copy of information given to New York Commissioners of Indian affairs.

1704, May 13. General Assembly of Connecticut to Lord Cornbury, declining to grant money for fort at Albany.

1704, May 17. Samuel Partridge and William Whiting, about dismissing forces at Hatfield.

1704, June 10. Caleb and Nathaniel Stanley to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop, transmitting letters.

1704, June 29. Richard Christophers and Gurdon Saltonstall to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop about a watch to be kept at New London.

1704, Oct. 24. Plea of Joseph Johnson, defendant, against Fitz-John Winthrop, plaintiff.

1704. Copy of order to Richard Bushnell to warn Owaneco to attend General Court.

1704. Copy of paper about houses burned at Deerfield.

1704? Minutes of instructions to Major Whiting. Two pieces.

1704? Instructions to Connecticut Commissioners in the Mohegan case.

1704? Names of Pequots who went scouting with Captain Avery.

No date. Memorandum, in handwriting of Gurdon Saltonstall, about Narragansett papers.

170 $\frac{1}{2}$, Jan. 9. Capt. Abraham Fowler to Committee of War at Hartford.

170 $\frac{1}{2}$, March 24. Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop to naval officer at Saybrook about French privateers.

1705, April 12. Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop to naval officer at New Haven about French privateers.

1705, August 24. Copy of protest of Connecticut agents against proceedings of Court of Commissioners at Stonington. See "Mohegan Case," printed in 1769, pp. 32, 33.

1705? Original brief of Governor and Council of Connecticut in their appeal to the Privy Council on the Mohegan Case, with notes of counsel in London.

170 $\frac{1}{2}$, Feb. 14. Lords Commissioners of Trade to Governor of Connecticut, instructing aid to Colonel Quarry.

1706, June 13. Daniel Wetherell and Richard Christophers to Timothy Mather about Saybrook ferry.

1706, June 17. Copy of a letter from Johannes Schuyler et al. to Col. Samuel Partridge about movements of French and Indians.

1706, June 19. Orders of Connecticut Council about minute-men and beacons.

1706, August 13. Ebenezer Johnson to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop, naming soldiers in New Haven County to be relied on in any emergency.

1706. Similar list of soldiers in Fairfield County, unsigned.

1706. Unexecuted marriage license for Isaac Arnold of Nassau Island, and Elizabeth Blackleach of Wethersfield, drawn up according to law of New York.

1706-1714. Copies of town votes of Groton. Five pieces.

1706, Jan. 20. John Southmayd et al. of Waterbury, to Committee of War at Hartford.

1706, Jan. 27. Copies of Quakers' memorial to Privy Council against Connecticut laws. Two pieces.

1707, August 14. Deputy-Governor Treat to New Haven constables about collection of rates.

1707, August 18. New Haven selectmen about collection of rates.

1712, Nov. 21. Protest of Wait Winthrop et al. about lands at Nawayonck.

1712, Nov. 21. A similar protest with more signatures.

1713, May 14. Complaint of Pequots to Connecticut General Court about lands at Nawayonk.

1713, June 11. Copy of summons to witnesses in case of trespass at Nawayonk.

1724, Feb. Letter and Address of Episcopalians of New London to the London Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Two pieces.

Manuscripts of which the State Library of Connecticut already possessed either the originals or duplicates, and which were therefore given to the Library of the Connecticut Historical Society at the desire of that Society.

1634, March 19. The Warwick Patent of Connecticut. A copy by Secretary Kimberly.

1644, Dec. The agreement with Colonel Fenwick for the purchase of Saybrook Fort. A copy by Caleb Stanley, Jr., certified by Secretary Kimberly.

1654. Copy of an Act of Commissioners of United Colonies. See Plym. Col. Rec., vol. x. p. 130.

1659, Sept. Several Acts of Commissioners of United Colonies. Copied by Daniel Clark, certified by John Mason. See Plym. Col. Rec., vol. x. pp. 232-234.

1663-1665. Copies of four short Acts of Connecticut General Court on one paper. Handwriting of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. i. pp. 419, 420, 433, 440.

166 $\frac{1}{2}$, Feb. 22. Duplicate of letter from King Charles II. to Governor and Council of Connecticut.

1666, April 10. Copy by Secretary Allyn of a letter from King Charles II. to Governor and Council of Connecticut. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. ii. p. 514.

— Another copy of the preceding by Secretary Kimberly.

1666, May. Act concerning the bounds of Nameaug and Monheag. A copy by George Denison from Secretary Allyn's copy. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. ii. p. 42.

1666, 1670. Two Connecticut Acts about Stonington, copied by Secretary George Wyllys. See Col. Rec., vol. ii. pp. 36, 43.

1671, Oct. Order of court for plantation at Quinebaug. George Denison's copy of Secretary Allyn's copy. See Col. Rec., vol. ii. p. 165.

1674, May. Act of Connecticut General Court about Mistick and Paucatuck. Certified copy by Secretary Wyllys. See Col. Rec., vol. ii. p. 227.

1674, 1693. Two short Acts about Stonington. Certified copy by Secretary Wyllys. See Col. Rec., vol. ii. p. 241, and vol. iv. p. 96.

1679. Imperfect copy of Acts of Commissioners of United Colonies. See Plym. Col. Rec., vol. x. p. 409.

1691, March. Copies of Records of New London County Court; Liveen estate. Two pieces.

1693, Sept. Several Acts of Assembly, copied by Secretary Allyn. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 102.

1693, Oct. Proceedings of Commissioners at New York relative to aid to New York. Copy by Caleb Stanley, Jr., certified by Secretary Allyn.

169 $\frac{1}{2}$, Jan. 29. Copy of order of reference to Lords Commissioners of Trade of complaint of Connecticut against Governor Fletcher.

1694, June 21. Copy of Queen Mary's letter to Connecticut about defence of New York. Handwriting of Fitz-John Winthrop.

1694. Duplicate account of Connecticut charges in aid of New York.

169 $\frac{1}{2}$, Feb. 9. Order of Lords Commissioners of Trade about aid to New York.

169 $\frac{1}{2}$, Feb. 23. Copy of letter from Lords Commissioners of Trade; prohibition to enter service of Foreign States.

1698, May. Copies of Acts of Assembly, certified by Secretary Kimberly.

1698, Oct. Copy of Connecticut Act about Pequots. Handwriting of Fitz-John Winthrop. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 280.

1698, Oct. Order of Connecticut General Court to send printed law-book to England. Copy by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 442.

1699, April 24. Duplicate of letter from Lords Commissioners of Trade to Governor and Company of Connecticut.

1699, Oct. Governor and Council of Connecticut about appeals to England. Copy by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 300.

1699, Oct. Act of Connecticut Assembly about Massachusetts encroachments on Windsor lands. Copy by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 301.

1700, May. Act of Connecticut Assembly about boundaries. Copy by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 319.

1700, Oct. Copy of vote of Connecticut Assembly about sending letter to England. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 337.

1701, May. Several Acts of Connecticut Assembly, copied by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 348.

1703, Oct. Vote of Connecticut Assembly declining to comply with Governor Dudley's request for men. Copy by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 444.

1703, Oct. Copy, by Secretary Kimberly, of Act of Assembly establishing Council of War. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 442.

1703, Dec. 17. Copy of order of reference to Privy Council of appeal of Edward Palmes.

1703½, Jan. 7. Duplicate of preceding order, and another copy of it certified by Secretary Kimberly. Two pieces.

1703½, March. Copy of Acts of Assembly, by Secretary Kimberly. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 445, etc.

1705, Oct. Copy, by Secretary Kimberly, of Act of Assembly about naval stores. See Col. Rec., vol. iv. p. 532.

1707, April. Copy, by Secretary Kimberly, of vote of Assembly declining to aid in Governor Dudley's expedition against Nova Scotia. See Col. Rec., vol. v. p. 18.

1708, May. Copy, by Secretary Kimberly, of proposals about Stonington train-band. See Col. Rec., vol. v. p. 23.

1713, Oct. Copy of Act of Connecticut General Assembly about Pequots. See Col. Rec., vol. v. p. 398.

Manuscripts immediately relating to Essex County, Massachusetts, and given to the Library of the Essex Institute, at Salem.

1637, June 21. A petition to the Governor and Council of Massachusetts from Richard Saltonstall and fifty-five others of the principal

inhabitants of Ipswich, Massachusetts, remonstrating against the reported intention of the Governor and Council to appoint John Winthrop, Jr., to be Captain of the Castle at Boston, thereby necessitating his removal from Ipswich. Printed in 2 Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc., vol. iii. pp. 198, 199. Valuable for its autograph signatures, some of which are very rare, if not unique.

1637, Oct. 18. An agreement, about pasturing cattle at Ipswich, between John Winthrop, Jr., and his brother-in-law, Rev. Samuel Dudley.

1638, June 28. Original quit-claim deed by Masconomet, Sagamore of Agawam, to John Winthrop, Jr., of all his lands in and about Ipswich and Chebacco. This deed is certified by Secretary Edward Rawson, Feb. 15, 1682, to have been then compared word for word with the original record, at the request of Wait Winthrop. It is printed in Felt's History of Ipswich, p. 8.

1638-9. Original acknowledgment of Masconomet, Sagamore of Agawam, that he had received of John Winthrop, Jr., full satisfaction "in wampam peage and other things" for the land between "Labour in vaine creeke" and "Chybacko creeke," and that for the sum of £20 he relinquishes all his rights in the town of Ipswich. The body of this acknowledgment is in the handwriting of John Winthrop, Jr., and it is witnessed by Giles Firmin, Deane Winthrop, and others, but it is not dated. It is, however, mentioned in the proceedings of a General Court at Boston, March 13, 1638. See Records of Mass., vol. i. p. 252.

1666, March 28. Copy, or duplicate, of articles of complaint against the Rev. Thomas Gilbert, of Topsfield.

1684. Original deed of Pine Island, Ipswich; on parchment, with some interesting signatures.

Given to the Library of the Long Island Historical Society, at Brooklyn.

1664, June 10. Original deed of Tabacus, Sachem of Unquachang, to Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., of a large tract of land on Long Island. Dated at Brookhaven and witnessed by Samuel Willys and Richard Howell.

1664, June 9. A certified copy of the preceding, taken from "the Record booke of Brookehaven" by "John Tooker, Recorder," dated "Setawkett, June 9, 1664." There is apparently a mistake in the day of the month, as it is one day earlier than the date of the deed.

1680, March 2. A paper certified as having been examined by Secretary Mathias Nicolls of New York and endorsed "a copy extracted out of the records of Seatalecott," containing a copy of the preceding certificate of John Tooker," together with a copy of an agreement between the Sachem Tabacus and the inhabitants of Brookhaven, dated

June 10, 1664, and witnessed by Richard Howell and John Cooper. To this agreement is appended the copy of an affidavit of said Tabacus, witnessed by John Howell and John Young, that he never sold any land to John Scott.

1680, March 30. The original patent of Edmund Andros, Governor of New York, confirming to Fitz-John Winthrop the estate on Long Island conveyed by Tabacus to his father. Countersigned by Secretary Mathias Nicolls.

1701, Dec. 23. Letter from Secretary Clarkson of New York to Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop concerning the fees for passing a patent for the manor of "Groton Hall" upon Long Island. See 5 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. viii. pp. 378, 379.

No date. A large map entitled "Plan of the Manor of Groton Hall on Nassau, alias Long, Island in the Province of New York in America." Probably prepared for John Winthrop, F.R.S., nephew of Fitz-John Winthrop, during his residence in England, as there exists a power of attorney from him dated in London, Oct. 25, 1746, empowering his wife and sons-in-law, Joseph Wanton and Gurdon Saltonstall, to sell the estate, then estimated to consist of a tract about ten miles square.

Mr. JUSTIN WINSOR made the following statement respecting the early editions of the first letter of Columbus. There are several varieties of the original Spanish text known in manuscript; but not one of them is in Columbus's hand, or shows certainly his own language. It was not till 1852 that any contemporary printed edition of the Spanish text was known. In that year the library of an Italian nobleman was left to the Biblioteca Ambrosiana at Milan, and in it was found a Spanish edition; and this remained the only one known till within a year or so, when almost simultaneously two other editions were discovered. These are now, or were lately, in the hands of dealers respectively in London and Paris, — one inviting offers but naming no price, and the other asking 65,000 francs, or \$13,000!

The letter was put into Latin in Spain, and the version was carried to Italy, and within twelve months eight different editions were issued in the shape of thin quartos or octavos in black-letter type, — five in Rome, two in Paris, and one in Antwerp. Bibliographers have not been able to agree upon their order of publication. The copy recently bought by the Boston Public Library has been claimed by Harris and others

to be the earliest of all ; but the weight of testimony is not in its favor. Of these eight editions, the one printed at Antwerp is only known in a copy discovered not long since in the Royal Library at Brussels. A copy in the library at Turin is also unique. The British Museum has two copies each of two editions and an imperfect one of a third, of which the Lenox Library has the only complete copy. The Lenox Library has three editions. The library of the late John Carter Brown, at Providence, has four editions, and stands at the head of all collections for its variety of these issues. The Huth Collection, in London, which was formed by a rich banker, now deceased, has two editions. The great libraries at Paris, Göttingen, and Munich have one each. Two copies of the same edition as that recently sold are in the British Museum, and are the only other copies known. The library of the late Henry C. Murphy had two editions, according to the Catalogue, but one proved to be a fac-simile. They were bought by Mr. Charles H. Kalbfleisch, of New York. As many as ten copies are known of the Roman edition, which is, in the opinion of most bibliographers, the first ; and two of these copies are respectively in the collection of the Duc d'Aumale, at Twickenham, and in the Public Library at Hamburg. A copy of this edition was bought at the sale of the Dr. Court library in Paris a few years ago by one of the Rothschilds for 7,000 francs. Quaritch, of London, held a copy two years ago at £280. Another edition has changed hands of late years at 5,000 francs. There may be, then, about thirty copies of these eight editions known ; and of these not more than five or six are ever likely to come on the market.

The Hon. ROBERT C. WINTHROP then rose, and spoke in substance as follows :—

I have no formal communication for this afternoon, Mr. President. But before presenting what I have in my hand, I may be pardoned for an off-hand word or two, suggested by your excellent introductory address. I desire to express at once my cordial concurrence in all you have said in regard to our Centennial Anniversary. You alluded incidentally, however, to our Alma Mater at Cambridge,—to the statue of John Harvard near the Memorial Hall. A beautiful statue it certainly is, and one which does great credit to the artist as

well as to the generous friend to whom we owe it; but I cannot help saying that I have always thought it unfortunate, to say the least, that the only statue on the grounds of an institution whose motto is *Veritas* should present a figure which is wholly fictitious, and an inscription which is historically false.

The College was certainly not founded, as that inscription states, in 1638. The Constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, expressly declares that it was founded as early as the year 1636. Accordingly we celebrated its Two hundredth Anniversary in 1836, and its Two hundred and fiftieth Anniversary in 1886. The College was founded by the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and ought always to be recognized as the child of the State. Young Henry Vane was Governor of Massachusetts at that time, having succeeded Winthrop in the Chief Magistracy for that single year. Winthrop was serving under Vane as Deputy-Governor; and Edward Everett, in presiding at our Two hundredth Anniversary, — as he did with inimitable felicity, — puts into Winthrop's mouth the motion for the foundation and endowment of the College, and an eloquent speech in its favor. But Henry Vane was the Chief Magistrate on the occasion.

I have never been so great an admirer of that interesting young man as some of our recent orators and biographers. But an unjust and cruel death has given him a halo of martyrdom, and an exquisite sonnet of Milton has embalmed his memory for all ages. The history of our University should not be deprived of such a name; nor, let me add, ought the somewhat checkered career of Vane to be shorn of the glory of having presided at the foundation of what is now the great university of our country. Meantime the name of John Harvard needs no borrowed honors. It has been given irrevocably to the whole institution of which he was the earliest benefactor. His bequest of eight hundred pounds in 1638 enabled our wise and pious ancestors, as the Constitution calls them, to carry on the infant College successfully, and we cannot hold his name in too much honor. But we can never forget that Harvard could not have left eight hundred pounds to the College as the contemporary records tell us, unless there had been a college already founded to be the subject of his memorable endowment. It was the known

existence of the College which led to the bequest, and not the bequest which founded the College.

Let me now proceed, without further delay, to the brief communication which I had contemplated making this afternoon. In the last Annual Report of the Council of this Society, which has been but recently printed in the latest volume of our Proceedings, an allusion was justly made to the long, long delay which has occurred in the preparation of a memoir of one of our most accomplished and valuable Resident Members, the late Hon. Francis C. Gray. There seems to have been a fatality in regard to this memoir. Assigned originally to his intimate friend, Mr. Ticknor, and since the death of Mr. Ticknor to Dr. Lothrop, and, I believe, to more than one other of our members, it has long been expected, often been promised, but never been forthcoming. Mr. Gray died, lamented by all who knew him, in January, 1857. A man so accomplished, so quick-witted, so genial, with such a marvellous memory and such an exhaustless fund of information and anecdote, has rarely lived among us. I was then President of the Society, and paid a tribute to his memory in announcing his death. Mr. Savage followed me in a most impressive account of his great abilities and accomplishments. By some accident the remarks of Mr. Savage as well as my own tribute were overlooked in making up our first printed volume of Proceedings. I have found, however, among my old papers, a cutting from a newspaper in which they were printed at the time, and I now present it *in memoriam rei*, and for such use as the Publishing Committee may see fit to make of it. It may at least serve to show that we were not unmindful at the time of the great loss which the Society sustained in the death of Mr. Gray; and possibly it may be instrumental in bringing forth the promised memoir.

Let me proceed in the next place to fulfil the request contained in the following note:—

LEXINGTON, MASS., Feb. 6, 1890.

HON. R. C. WINTHROP, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR,—To-day is the sixty-fifth anniversary of the death of Gov. William Eustis; and his niece, Mrs. Elizabeth Eustis Langdon Porter, desires me to offer through you, for the acceptance of the

Massachusetts Historical Society, the enclosed photographic likeness of Governor Eustis, copied from an original portrait painted by Stuart. Similar copies have been presented to the New England Genealogical and Historical Society in Boston, and to the Historical Society of Lexington. Mrs. Porter and myself trust that it is not putting you to inconvenience to hand the enclosed to the Society.

With our best wishes for your continued good health, I remain, with sentiments of respect and high regard,

Dear Sir, very truly yours,

G. W. PORTER.

William Eustis — a photograph of whose portrait, with his autograph signature, is thus sent to us by his niece — was no ordinary man. A surgeon in the army of the American Revolution, a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, a Secretary of War in the cabinet of James Madison, a Minister Plenipotentiary to Holland, and finally dying as Governor of Massachusetts, — his official career was certainly most notable. He was the last of our Revolutionary Governors, — Hancock, Bowdoin, Samuel Adams, John Brooks, and others having preceded him. Levi Lincoln and Marcus Morton and George N. Briggs followed him. I recall his election as Governor in 1824. There was no Australian method then. There was no separate voting in wards or districts. The whole voting of the city of Boston was in Faneuil Hall; and I remember well standing at the doors of the old Cradle of Liberty, with other boys of the Latin School, and distributing votes for William Eustis, though it was six years before I was old enough to have a vote of my own. I recall his fine appearance as Commander-in-chief, in the old Revolutionary buff and blue uniform, on state occasions, and particularly during the visit of Lafayette to Massachusetts. He was then more than seventy years old. I recall his death and funeral. His body was brought in from the old Governor Shirley mansion in Roxbury, where he had resided, and laid in the State House, where the Cadets did guard duty around it by night and by day. My father, then a member of the Massachusetts State Senate, was chairman of the committee for the funeral ceremonies, so that I was in the way of taking note of the arrangements. The militia of the Commonwealth were summoned from long distances to escort the procession, under the command of Gen. Theodore Lyman; and many of them were encamped on Boston

Common, then covered with snow, on the night before the funeral. The next day there was one of the earliest of those multitudinous military funeral pageants which have become so common in later years. All these details, I doubt not, and many more, will be found in the old "Columbian Centinel" and other journals of February, 1825, and I present the photograph without trespassing longer on the attention of the Society.

The report of the meeting held immediately after the death of Mr. Gray, to which reference is made in the foregoing remarks, appeared in the "Boston Post," Jan. 9, 1857. The part relating to Mr. Gray is as follows: —

"MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY.—At the regular monthly meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the President, Hon. ROBERT C. WINTHROP, after the usual reading of the record, announced the death of Hon. Francis C. Gray substantially in the following terms:—

"The opening year, gentlemen, finds us with a freshly created vacancy in our little number, which, though not unexpected for many weeks or even months past, cannot fail to be the subject of sincere regret to us all. We are called on to remember, this morning, that death has deprived us of one of those who have been longest and most actively associated with us. The name of Francis C. Gray stood third on the catalogue of our living Resident Members, as recently revised and published in our last volume. He was elected on the 21st day of January, 1818, and had thus nearly completed the thirty-ninth year of his membership. I need not remind you that during this period he had rendered many and most valuable services to this Society, as a member both of the Standing Committee and of the Publishing Committee, and as a contributor of interesting and important matter to our Collections.

"His discovery of a manuscript copy of the early laws of Massachusetts Bay, called "The Body of Liberties," and the elaborate and thorough elucidation of its history with which he accompanied its publication in the eighth volume of our third series, have hardly been surpassed in interest or in value by anything which our volumes have ever contained. His zeal and vigilance in vindicating the title of our Society to manuscript papers which had long been among our most cherished treasures, — as he most successfully and conclusively did on more than one occasion, — have created a claim upon our grateful remembrance, by no means less strong and enduring because the service at the time was the subject of no public record. Nor would we forget our obliga-

tions for the interest with which he entered into the recent purchase and improvement of our hall, and for his efforts and his example in raising the necessary funds for that purpose.

“But it is not my province, on this occasion, to attempt any formal enumeration of Mr. Gray’s services to this Society, or of his larger and more important benefactions to the community in which he lived. His numerous and generous contributions of time, of money, and of his own great abilities, in so many ways, to the cause of literature, learning, and science, will form the appropriate theme of those who shall be called to treat of him more deliberately hereafter. I may add only, in a single word, that as a man of elegant accomplishments, of vast and varied acquisition, of thorough, exact, and well-digested information, ready at all times to be communicated in private conversation or in public discourse, he has left no superior, and few equals, in this or any other community.

“He died on the 29th of December last, at the age of sixty-six years. The Standing Committee would at once have issued a notice for the attendance of the Society at his funeral, had they not ascertained on inquiry that such a course would be in contravention to his own expressed wishes. The event proved, however, that no notice was necessary, and a large proportion of our number was found among the throng of friends who were present on that melancholy occasion. An opportunity is now presented for the Society to manifest their sense of the loss which they have sustained, and to provide for a suitable memoir of so accomplished and valued an associate.’

“HON. JAMES SAVAGE rose and said, that in looking round the Society, it seemed to him we might not be able to designate so promptly a member to perform the usual service of preparing a suitable memoir of our late associate, as we certainly must be to adopt the vote he would first offer, — that this Society deeply feel the loss sustained, since our last meeting, by the death of Hon. Francis C. Gray. After the meeting had adopted the vote, he proceeded : —

“Sir, we may well lament the deprivation of such a companion, to whose various acquirements in science, of whatever section, in art, whether useful or polite, hardly an equal could be found in any two of our remaining members. I have not heard of one in our country to be regarded as his superior in the aggregate of these riches, nor ever known any so distinguished in the universality of his studies. This distinction arose not solely from the number of degrees in the circumference of his knowledge, but equally from penetration towards the centre.

“It just now occurs to my mind, that among the companions of Dr. Johnson, as in his biography by Boswell we learn, one scholar was by them frequently called *omniscient* Jackson; but the great moralist

put in the ready objection to that epithet, for the Governor of the Universe only could thus be honored. Yet even he would acquiesce in the phrase *all knowing*; and I may not seem presumptuous, perhaps, when, with highest esteem for one and another of our associates, no hesitation is felt in saying that, to a question in philosophy, law, history, political economy, letters, or any topic in which human society takes great interest, would an answer from Mr. Gray more surely satisfy an intimate acquaintance than one from any other gentleman. It would be received without appeal.

“‘With these views, Mr. President, I submit what may appear a reasonable proposition, though diverse from our usual course; and I move that the nomination of one of our members, to write a just memorial for our Collections upon the late Hon. Francis C. Gray, be made by the President at some future meeting of the Society.’”

The Hon. MELLEŒ CHAMBERLAIN was called on by the President to give some account of the recent sale of the Aspinwall-Barlow library, and spoke in substance as follows:—

The sale of the Aspinwall-Barlow collection of books and manuscripts in New York City, on the afternoons and evenings of February 3–8, attracted attention on both sides of the Atlantic; and more particularly here in Boston, as the City Council had made a special appropriation of \$20,000 for the purchase of books on American history not found in the Public Library. I attended this sale on behalf of the Library, and the President has asked me to give a running account of it.

Colonel Aspinwall, the projector of the library, Corresponding and afterward Resident Member of the Historical Society, was well known to its older members. He frequently visited our rooms, where I was introduced to him by Dr. Deane,—not long before his death, I think,—but nothing passed between us save the salutations customary on such occasions. As I desire to give some account of his library and its dispersion, it is a matter of regret that his memoir, successively assigned to three of our members whose death has prevented its preparation, remains uncompleted; nor from other sources have I been able to add much to what is already in print.

The larger part of Colonel Aspinwall's collection was made while he was consul at London, between 1816 and 1854, and remained in his possession until September, 1864, when that

which was most valuable, exclusive of duplicates, was sold to Samuel L. M. Barlow, of New York City. The part retained by Colonel Aspinwall was sold, after his death, at the auction-rooms of Leonard & Co., June 3 and 4, 1879.

The manuscript catalogue of the books sold to Mr. Barlow, now in the Public Library, contains 2,788 volumes, exclusive of maps and manuscripts; and the auction catalogue, 3,849, — from which it appears that Colonel Aspinwall's whole library, including duplicates, contained 6,637 volumes.

Mr. Barlow's purchase, wholly of Americana, was removed to New York City, — "two hundred or more of the choicest works" in the personal custody of his agent, and the bulk of the collection forwarded as freight. These last were deposited in the book-rooms of C. B. Richardson, on Broadway, to await the preparation of Mr. Barlow's house to receive them, and during the night of the 18th of September, 1864, were entirely destroyed by fire.

I have taken some pains, but not with entire success, to learn what particular books escaped destruction, and especially which of them have now become the property of the Public Library. There appeared, without date or imprint, a catalogue of Colonel Aspinwall's library arranged chronologically; and as the last entry is Irving's "*Voyages and Discoveries of Columbus*," published in 1831, it may be fairly inferred that the catalogue appeared not much later.

A comparison of titles, dates, imprints, and sizes found in this early catalogue with those appearing in the auction catalogue affords ground for conjecture, where they are the same, that they describe identical volumes. Of course it is possible that volumes appearing in the later catalogue are replacements of those in the first destroyed by fire; but this test gives at least approximate results. From such a comparison it appears that of the 771 titles in the printed catalogue, 229 escaped fire, and 542 were burned; and of those which escaped 2 were of the fifteenth century, 17 of the sixteenth, 114 of the seventeenth, 65 of the eighteenth, and 31 of the nineteenth century. Thirty-two of these, chiefly those printed before 1700, and by far the most valuable, were purchased for the Public Library.

When Colonel Aspinwall sold his library to Mr. Barlow, it contained 2,788 volumes, of which 2 titles were of the

fifteenth century, 42 of the sixteenth, 324 of the seventeenth, 1169 of the eighteenth, and 671 of the nineteenth century.

Had these catalogues been arranged in the same way, it would not be difficult to learn approximately the volumes burned; but the sale catalogue is chronological, and the auction catalogue alphabetical, which makes the labor of comparison disproportionate to the value of the results.

I have made considerable, but vain search for a contemporaneous account of the fire, and of the volumes consumed. There must have been such an account at the time, for I remember specially regretting the loss of the Boston edition of Jefferson's writings with marginalia by Coleridge. This would interest us now, as showing the opinions of the greatest English philosophical idealist who acknowledged the sincerity of phenomena, respecting the opinions and conduct of the greatest political idealist of any age who administered the affairs of an empire.

The portion of Colonel Aspinwall's library — chiefly foreign works and duplicate Americana — which was not included in the Barlow purchase was sold, as I have said, by Leonard & Co. in June, 1879. The time of the year was most unfortunate, — a time when many who usually purchased at such sales were either out of town or busily engaged in preparations to go. The sale was a sacrifice. I never witnessed a worse. The impression must have gone abroad that the catalogue contained the refuse, odds and ends, of Colonel Aspinwall's library. On the contrary, it was a rather choice collection of uncommonly well bound books in many departments of literature, and especially rich in seventeenth and eighteenth century colonial monographs and manuscripts.

Among the Americana, with the prices at which they sold, were Hakluyt's *West Indies*, 1555, \$16; Ward's *Simple Cocker*, two copies at \$13 each; *Good Speed to Virginia*, 1609, \$15; Josselyn's *New England Rarities*, 1672, \$16; Josselyn's *Two Voyages*, 1674, \$15; Pynchon's *Meritorious Price*, \$42 (sold at the Barlow sale for \$480); Morton's *New English Canaan*, \$63, another copy, \$26; Lechford's *Plain Dealing*, three copies respectively at \$41, \$37, \$32.75; Wood's *New England's Prospect*, \$31; Hennepin's *New Discovery*, 1699, \$23.50, another copy, \$16.50; Savage's *Account of the Late Action*, 1691, \$25.50; Mayhew's *Experience*, \$3; Massachu-

setts Historical Society Collections, complete set, \$75; Almon's Remembrancer, complete set, \$64; Massacre of 5th March, the rare Boston edition, 1770, \$4.38; Stith's History of Virginia, 1753, \$13; Peters's History of Connecticut, \$24.50; Beverley's History of Virginia, 1722, \$9.50; Keith's History of the British Plantations, 1733, \$11.25; De Quesne's Expedition to Ohio, 1683, \$1; Cotton's Bloody Tenent, \$6; Whitbourne's Discourse and Discovery of New Found Land, \$4.50.

The above are only a few of similar rarities which might be mentioned, and I am at loss to understand why some of them were not included in the Barlow purchase. The prices given above, though low, were not ridiculously low,—a fact owing to the presence of Sabin, the dealer in books from New York. The other books sold, in many cases, at half the cost of their bindings, or even less.

I attended on behalf of the Library, and bought 305 lots; but as it was not the policy of the Trustees at that time to purchase originals when they had reprints, none of those mentioned above went to its shelves.

For my own library I secured about a dozen volumes, among which was a copy of Scaliger's Poetics which had belonged to Pope, and contained two of his autographs. The price of this was \$1.87. I also bought at thirty cents the joint venture of Coleridge, Lamb, and Lloyd in poetry, Bristol, 1797, usually quoted at a guinea. But this copy contained an original sonnet and other writing by Charles Lamb, though unknown to me at the time. It was a shot in the dark.

When it became known that the Barlow library was to be sold at public auction, the Trustees of the Public Library thought best to secure some portion of it, if possible. As a whole, the Public Library is one of the most symmetrical of large libraries. Its foundations were laid by men of wide erudition and sound judgment, and removed as far as possible from lopsidedness or provincialism. Their selections were supplemented from time to time by the Barton, Ticknor, Bowditch, Parker, Hunt, Thayer, and Congressional collections, which make the Library uncommonly strong in those departments. It is also a good working library for American history, but mainly in reprints. It bears no comparison with the Harvard College Library in original authorities; and aside from the Prince collection, which is only a deposit, it is weak.

This state of things does not reflect upon the earlier Trustees. On the other hand, it is greatly to their credit that they never applied the income of the trust funds, or the annual appropriation of the city, to any purpose which would divide the judgments of the people; and the exceptional richness of the Library in the departments above mentioned is due to the fact that all of them save the Barton collection were gifts, and that was purchased by a special appropriation.

To supply the deficiency in original Americana, for which neither the income of the trust funds nor the annual appropriation could be used consistently with good trusteeship, the Trustees asked of the City Council a special appropriation of \$20,000. That sum was granted with a distinct understanding of its intended use, — the purchase of rare and costly works on America.

The desirableness of possessing such works in their original editions, I think I need not trouble myself to discuss in this presence. Making no account of the prestige given to a great library by the possession of the original sources of the history of the country in which it is established, and merely adverting to the encouragement given to historical research by access to original authorities, I think that no one who writes and that no one who reads history fails to observe how much more vital, stimulating, and satisfactory in many ways is an original authority than a copy or reprint. Its age makes it a part of the history which it records. For certain purposes the latest edition of an historical work, with its accumulated wealth of notes adding or correcting facts from new light, may be indispensable. And since history is always seeking and never coming to the truth, it is also doubtless true that the earliest history is more correctly read in the light of the latest history. But no eyes other than our own eyes can adequately trace for us the development of institutions from their germs; through no other eyes than our own can we recognize the signs of vital truth or the seeds of fatal error.

With these views the Trustees for some years past have sought to put the Library on a respectable footing in original authorities relating to American history. But this is becoming more and more difficult. Formerly when they ordered from foreign catalogues they obtained, on an average, five of every seven numbers; of late years, not two, and those the least desirable, — so great is the demand for them.

At the Barlow sale, however, were the needed books, and in the city treasury was the money needed for their purchase. This was put at the disposal of the Trustees. Such a conjunction of desirable circumstances was not to be overlooked. Of course the Trustees were aware that other parties were similarly desirous and equally able to make purchases, and that these facts would undoubtedly considerably appreciate prices. And if they could have carried forward the appropriation indefinitely and waited, say a hundred years, for such books as they lacked to appear from time to time in the market, perhaps they might have wisely waited. But all experience was against such a course, and no second conjunction of circumstances so favorable as those above mentioned could be reasonably expected.

Prices would rule high, and all that the Trustees could reasonably expect was that they would not be made so by fictitious bids. Of this there were no suspicions. Their purchases amounted to \$20,274.

They endeavored to secure a fair share,—for to have secured all was impossible,—first, of books relating to the discoveries of America; secondly, of its settlements; and thirdly, of its growth and history, giving the preference to Massachusetts and New England history. Among other purchases was the Latin translation of the first document published concerning the discovery of the New World, and printed in 1493. This was the Columbus letter, for which they gave \$2,900; and this, as I learn from the public journals, has given rise to two questions,—first, whether the book is very rare; and secondly, whether the price was not excessive. Those questions were duly considered by the Trustees. The pedigree of this copy is well known. It belonged to Colonel Aspinwall, and was in his possession as early as 1831. It is therefore presumably a genuine copy. It does not claim to be unique. The Trustees were aware, generally, of the number of known copies, and of their likelihood of coming upon the market. They also knew that the letter had been printed earlier in Spanish, and that other copies claimed priority of publication. Much of this the catalogue very frankly informed them; but they also knew these facts from other sources. They thus deliberately made the purchase at a price higher by a little than that at which they hoped to acquire it. This was on Tuesday. On Friday they were given to understand that they

could re-sell it at a very considerable advance ; but they were in New York to buy books, not to sell them. They paid nearly \$3,000 for the first Latin copy. They might have waited to purchase the first Spanish copy since offered to them at the Library at \$10,000 as its lowest price. But they did not wait.

Besides the Columbus letter, the following are some of the principal works purchased for the Public Library: Appolinus, *De Peruviae inventione*, 1567 ; Bergomas, *Novissime Historiarum repercussiones*, 1506 ; Cabeça de Vaca, *La relacion y comentarios*, 1555 ; Champlain, *Les Voyages*, 1613 ; Cieça de Leon, *La Chronica del Peru*, 1554 ; Creuxius, *Historiæ Canadensis libri decem*, 1664 ; Donck, *Beschryvinge van Nieuw-Nederlant*, 1655 ; Sir Francis Drake's *The World Encompassed*, 1653 ; Frobisher, *Narratio historica*, 1580 ; Garcilaso de la Vega, *La Florida del Inca*, 1605 ; Gardyner's *Description of the New World*, 1631 ; Gomara's *Historia General de las Indias*, 1553 ; Grynæus, *Novvs Orbis*, 1532 ; Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, 1589 ; Hawkins' *Observations*, 1622 ; Hernandez, *Historia del Peru*, 1571 ; Herrera, *Novus Orbis*, 1622 ; Las Casas, *Original Tracts*, 1552 ; Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation*, 1691 ; Pomponius Mela, *Cosmographia*, 1511 ; Monardes, *Joyfull Newes*, 1580 ; Carta del Padre Pedro de Morales, Mexico, 1579 ; Relation de la Levée du Siège de Québec, 1691 ; Sagard, *Le Grand Voyage du Pays*, 1632 ; Strabo, *Geographia*, 1512 ; Vespucius, *Paesi Nouamente Retrouati*, 1507 ; Xeres, *Conquista del Peru*, 1547, and Zarate, *Historia del Peru*, 1577 ; Anne Bradstreet, *The Tenth Muse*, 1650 ; Almon's *Remembrancer*, long sought for as complete ; Child's *New England's Jonas cast up*, 1647 ; Clark's *Ill News from New England*, 1651 ; various rare tracts of John Cotton ; Sir George Downing's *Verschejde Brieven Antwoorden*, 1662 ; Eliot's *Glorious Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians of New England*, 1649 ; Eliot's *Tears of Repentance*, 1653 ; Eliot's *Christian Commonwealth*, 1659 ; Eliot's *Farther Account*, 1660 ; Eliot's *Brief Narrative*, 1671 ; Eliot's *Harmony of the Gospels*, 1678 ; Gorges Tracts, 1658-9 ; Gorton's *Simplicities Defence*, 1646 ; Gorton's *Saltmarsh Returned from the dead*, 1655 ; Higginson's *New England Plantations*, second and third editions, 1630 ; Hooke's *New England's Tears*, 1641 ; The Massachusetts Psalter, Indian and English,

1709; Mourt's Relation, 1622; New England's Faction discovered, 1690; Pynchon's The Jewes Synagogue, 1652; Savage's Account of the late Action of the New Englanders under Sir Wm. Phips, 1691; Shepard's New England's Lamentation, 1645, and the Day Breaking, 1647; Capt. John Smith's True Relation, 1608, and Description of New England, 1616; Strength out of Weakness . . . Progress of the Gospel among the Indians in New England, 1652; Capt. John Underhill's Newes from America, 1638; White's Planters' Plea, 1630; Roger Williams's Key into the language of America, 1643; Bloody Tenent yet more Bloody, 1652; Experiment of Spiritual Life and Health, 1652; Winslow's Hypocrisie Unmasked, 1646, and the Danger of Tolerating Levellers, 1649; Wood's New England's Prospect, both editions, 1634, 1635.

The Trustees bid for other desirable works; but others were in attendance equally desirous of obtaining, and willing to pay more for them. Besides, no one party will be allowed to sweep the board with impunity. Moreover, the Trustees were obliged to carry forward to near the end of the sale a large but indefinite amount if they intended, as they certainly did, to bring home with them the volume of the Colony Records. Doubtless it would have been agreeable to them had the State found it convenient to relieve them from that necessity, and thus allowed them to purchase more books. But they fully appreciated the position of the State in the matter. There were three parties in the field for this volume; but before the bidding began the Lenox Library gracefully retired in the interest of the Public Library, which, as is well known, took the volume at \$6,500.

Mr. ABNER C. GOODELL, Jr., read a paper, as follows, on the origin of the towns in Massachusetts, in support of the views presented by the Hon. Mellen Chamberlain at the January meeting.

At our last meeting I was gratified to hear Judge Chamberlain's criticism of the late Professor Johnston's theory of the emigration of towns from Massachusetts to Connecticut. Had not the subject been thus favorably introduced, I should have hesitated to express my views upon it here, from

a doubt I have as to how far it is proper for us at our meetings to enter upon the field of criticism ; but since we have gone thus far, I ask your attention to some opinions on the general subject of the development of the town and State formed in the course of my researches into the legal and political history of our Commonwealth. I shall include some reference to the views of others which I deem unsound. This I have felt I could do more conveniently by incorporating in this essay the substance of a letter that I wrote a few years ago to a gentleman in Maryland who was investigating the subject of the relation of the Massachusetts town to the State, and who subsequently expressed his concurrence in the conclusions to which my studies had led me.

Among students, at home and abroad, of American history and politics, the opinion has generally been received without demur, that the towns were the foundation of our political system. The consideration of some prominent events which occurred just previous to the Revolution undoubtedly confirmed, if it did not beget, this opinion, which seems to have developed during the present century. The municipal machinery, which even during the colonial period had assumed substantially its present form, was devised gradually to meet the necessities or to suit the convenience of the people in the several plantations. Early in the provincial period this system was revised and adopted, without any material change, by the Province Act of 4 and 5 William and Mary, "for establishing townships, choice of town officers, and setting forth their power,"¹ which survived the adoption of the Constitution, and which is the basis of our existing laws on the subject.

The town-meeting, which was the most interesting and important feature of this system, had been found convenient for the initiation and concert of political measures. During the earlier progress of the Revolution it had afforded admirable facilities for uniting and inciting the people, both by resolutions and by the election and encouragement of representatives to the General Assembly, who availed themselves of their parliamentary privileges to resist unpopular measures with the utmost courage and vigor. Any attempt therefore to undermine or destroy this system would inflict a severe wound not soon

¹ Province Laws, 1692-3, chap. 28.

forgotten. But the Act of Parliament, 14 George III., chap. 45, by the seventh section of which selectmen in Massachusetts were absolutely prohibited from calling town-meetings, except by leave of a governor appointed by the Crown, deprived the town government of the one feature which in the popular mind had made it most sacred. This blow was not only soon resented on the battle-field, but was long remembered as the most damaging assault, short of armed coercion, that could possibly be made on the liberties of the people. Undoubtedly, too, this parliamentary interference revived the memories of those earlier measures of tyranny under Andros, when by the abolition of the House of Representatives the people were deprived of the highest privilege which could be exercised in the town-meeting,—the choice of deputies to the General Court.

The sons of Revolutionary sires would be very likely to impress the receptive minds of strangers eager to understand the theory of our government, with the importance of the town system, under which the management of all local and prudential affairs was conducted by such simple methods that the average citizen might hope to make an acceptable town officer, and all citizens were permitted to have an equal voice in the town-meeting,—that school of politics and of declamation. Hence I suspect De Tocqueville, who was a faithful disciple of the American political philosophers, returned from the United States to his native Paris so impressed with the political importance of this fundamental institution of the New World that he declared "The township seems to come from the hand of God." This is one of his discoveries in political science which led him to abandon his profession, in order to devote himself to the work of disseminating his views of American Democracy in the treatise which is still his conspicuous monument. He informs us that "political life had its origin in the townships; and it may almost be said that each of them originally formed an independent nation. When the kings of England afterwards asserted their supremacy, they were content to assume the central power of the State. They left the townships where they were before; and although they are now subject to the State, they were not at first, or were hardly so. They did not receive their powers from the central authority, but, on the contrary, they gave up a portion of their independence to the State."

To-day we have the school of historical students to which Judge Chamberlain has alluded with appropriate words of commendation, who, having adopted the theory of De Tocqueville, are endeavoring, with no little ingenuity and with unsparing labor and admirable enthusiasm, to trace this idea of the township back to our remotest ancestry. The Johns Hopkins University appears to be the centre of this enterprise, and Professor Johnston belonged to that school. Nearly nine years ago Dr. Adams, of Johns Hopkins University, read a paper before the Harvard Historical Society, on the "Germanic Origin of New England Towns," in which he affirmed that, "in New England especially, towns were the primordial cells of the body politic." It was about a year later that Professor Johnston gave to the world his "Genesis of a New England State," in which he applied the same idea to the case of the Connecticut colonists, and expressed the views, subsequently incorporated in his contribution to the series of histories of American Commonwealths, which were criticised at our last meeting. Judge Chamberlain, no doubt correctly, traces this school to Dr. Edward A. Freeman as its founder; but there can be little question, I think, that the cisatlantic disciples of this school are indebted to Dr. Adams for direction in their lines of investigation and in their methods of treatment.

I shrink from uttering a word in disparagement of these devoted and accomplished workers in the field of history. Yet I cannot but feel that until the American student has mastered the historical data which our own records and literature afford, his time will be less profitably employed in the remoter lines they are pursuing than in recovering, analyzing, and comparing these data with a view to explaining coeval and subsequent events and institutions, or in revising the work of earlier writers of American history. I am not unmindful of the recondite researches in local and general repositories (not arranged or indexed, and otherwise more or less difficult of access) which these scholars have made, but it seems to me that their prepossession of a theory detracts from the value of their conclusions. It has certainly misled them in their interpretation of some simple events. In history as in other sciences, plausible theories, and assumptions more or less rash can never supersede the unprejudiced study and exposition of plain facts, drawn from sources whose trustworthiness is exactly

proportioned to their nearness and notoriety. While I defer to opinions derived from the exhaustive and critical study of materials which generally are not accessible at first hand to students in America, and am willing to accept them for all their probable value in view of the fact that the scattered sources of this fragmentary and uncertain information furnish at best but slight foundation for anything more positive than conjecture, I do so without the sense of satisfaction which attends absolute conviction.

Notwithstanding the high authority on which the contrary opinion rests, I am obliged to confess that I have not been able to find that a town, as a fundamental, fixed, political entity, was ever anything but a figment. Neither is it clear to me that the township is a complete integral constituent of the State. Indeed, in the Legislature of Massachusetts, which of all the departments of government comes nearest to the full proportions of the State, the town no longer enjoys a distinct recognition by representation. For several years past both branches of the General Court have been composed of representatives or senators elected from districts not coterminous with the old political divisions, and no one seems to have discovered that we have undergone a radical revolution in the change. Now, since the towns, as such, never had any control of the executive and judicial branches of the government, they bear to-day no more potential or necessary relations to the State than do other corporations or persons. Yet the State survives this change, seemingly unimpaired in its essential constitution.

Let me trespass upon your time by a brief review of the steps by which our town system has reached its present state.

The Charter of Charles I. (1628) contemplated, first, the establishment of a company of merchant adventurers to promote the settlement of this colony, and thereby to increase the trade of the realm; and, second, a local government, under the corporation, for regulating the civil affairs of the colonists.

At the head of the corporation was Matthew Cradock, "Governor of the *Company*"; which, in turn, appointed Capt. John Endicott as chief manager or governor of the "plantation," or actual settlers, — in other words, the *colony*.

At first Endicott seems to have held a position analogous to

that of master of a ship over his crew and passengers; but in the spring of 1629 he was regularly appointed governor, with twelve councillors or assistants, one of whom was to be appointed deputy-governor; and these thirteen, constituting "the Governor and Council of London's Plantation in the Massachusetts Bay in New England," were required to choose a secretary for the colony, who, with them, was to be duly sworn to the faithful performance of duty. To this body was formally intrusted the sole ordering and management of the colony; and they were authorized "to make, ordain, and establish all manner of wholesome and reasonable laws, orders, ordinances, and constitutions" not repugnant to the laws of England, "for the administering of justice upon malefactors, and inflicting condign punishment upon all other offenders, and for the furtherance and propagating of the said plantation, and the more decent and orderly government of the inhabitants there." The seal of the company and a copy of the charter were sent to them; and they proceeded with the work of legislation and all the functions of government.

Such were the conditions under which Endicott organized his little band of pioneers at Salem into a body politic; and under the régime thus established, the local governments would have continued, doubtless, had not the whole scheme been changed by transferring the charter and the seat of the corporation from London to New England. By this event the double government contemplated in the charter, and adhered to up to the time of Winthrop's arrival, ceased, and the company took the exclusive and sole management of affairs here,¹ instead of controlling it in London. This change had probably been determined upon from the outset; and Winthrop was chosen governor with the express purpose of coming hither and assuming the immediate government of the colony in accordance with this determination. Whatever nice questions may be, or may have been, raised as to the legality of this proceeding, the stubborn fact remains that the thing was practically accomplished, with the acquiescence of the local administration already in being here; and no serious objection seems to have been made, by any of the parties concerned, to the soundness of the theory according to which this change appears to have been made,—that the government of the plantation, under Endicott, was in the nature of an

¹ See note on p. 329, post.

agency, liable to be superseded, *ipso facto*, whenever the principal (the corporation) should choose to remove hither and take the immediate direction of affairs.

The colonial establishment under which, after his new appointment, Endicott and his council acted without a legislature chosen by the people, was not dissimilar to the system followed in the government of other English colonies at that time, and was substantially identical with the system under which Dudley and Andros managed the affairs of the colony nearly sixty years later. The governor and council made all the laws, and exercised at the same time complete judicial and executive functions.

When, however, the whole corporation was removed hither, the *freemen* — that is, such of the original corporators as came over, as well as others subsequently chosen to membership under the charter — exercised the right of suffrage given to them by the charter, and by the common law applicable to corporations. On this narrow foundation the fabric of our popular civil government was reared.

The determination of what should constitute qualification for membership of the corporation devolved upon the corporators, in the absence of an express provision to the contrary in the charter. This permitted the introduction of a religious test in the admission of freemen. Some years later the inconvenience of assembling all the freemen at the meetings of the General Court of the Company suggested the plan of sending proxies or deputies; and from this, in turn, sprang our system of representation.

Hence it will be seen that there was no need of a *compact* of government, such as the Plymouth exiles entered into. The Massachusetts colonists were members of the Church of England, although Puritans or low-churchmen. They were entitled, as their unforfeited birthright as well as by the express words of the charter, to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of Englishmen, — in short, to the protection of the common law wherever they went; while the Pilgrims, on the other hand, were refugees, expatriated abjurors, and liable to the terrible consequences of a *præmunire* if found in England. The emigrants from Holland, as individuals, could as well claim protection from the Stadtholder as from the English Crown, though certain to be denied it by both. In this

dilemma they furnished the world with that remarkable precedent of an original, written, social compact.

Englishmen, I have said, in theory carry with them the common law wherever they go. The shipmaster on the high seas maintains discipline, rightfully, among his crew and passengers; nor is that authority lost by the accident of shipwreck, unless he is thus thrown within the limits of an established government. If the castaways are outside of any settled jurisdiction, the master has a right to prevent anarchy; and if there were no appointed head, each individual would have the right of self-protection, and of combining with his associates for the purpose of securing that end even by the taking of life if necessary. It follows too that people thus situated may lawfully constitute a proper forum for deciding disputes and for ascertaining guilt, and may appoint agents for executing judgment. This applies as well to the little communities which were the foundation of the Connecticut commonwealth as to the Pilgrims, whenever new exigencies in their respective situations required the exercise of autonomic power.

No such extremity, however, was presented in the case of Massachusetts; for as we have seen, its form of government was authorized by the Royal Charter, conformably to the rule under which the Crown has ever claimed authority over its foreign dominions. The Connecticut towns in turn were held in leading-strings by Massachusetts until she recognized their ability to go alone.

As new exigencies arose in the government of the Massachusetts Colony, they had to be met by new expedients, until at length the government here became complex, and nearly resembled, in its machinery for making, interpreting, and executing the laws, for raising revenue, and for subduing its enemies, etc., the government of the kingdom from which it sprang.

In a certain sense what is commonly said about the towns antedating the county and the State is true, since the body of planters who settled at Salem, and those who removed thence to Charlestown formed the nucleus of the quasi-corporate communities to which those town names were afterward given; and it may be added that the government of Salem was instituted before Endicott was formally appointed governor, and that of Charlestown before Winthrop held his first General

Court, and that both of these plantations were in being before the establishment of counties. But in the sense in which the statement is generally made and understood, I think it cannot be said that the municipal antedated the general government.

We have seen that Endicott was at first virtually autocrat of the Salem Colony; next he was appointed governor, with a council or board of assistants. His authority in each of these positions was co-extensive with the territory of the colony. For Maverick at Winnisimet, for Walford at Mishawum, for Blaxton at Shawmut, and for Wollaston and Morton in their settlements, he prescribed rules of discipline as well as for his company at Naumkeag; and from them all he exacted deference and required obedience.

There were then no town-meetings; indeed, the name "town," although the word appears in our records even before 1630, was not affixed to either of these plantations until some years later; and though Salem is said to have been *incorporated* July 24, 1629, this is only because the name "Salem" is supposed to have been then substituted for the original Indian name "Naumkeag," — a change which, when made in the case of other plantations by the General Court in subsequent years, has been regarded as the date of incorporation.

Under Winthrop and the charter, the freemen of the colony met to choose deputies, after it had been agreed that they should be represented in the General Court by deputies; but this, and the procuring and keeping of arms and ammunition and of sealed weights and measures, and a few other unimportant matters were all the duties that the several plantations were required to perform; and for even these there was no provision as to assembling the freemen.

It was not until March, 1635-6, that towns were directed and empowered, by an ordinance of the General Court, to manage their local affairs and to choose town officers therefor. This was the beginning of the town-meeting proper. Up to that time the General Court had legislated on all local as well as general affairs; and even the constables who were the town executives (for at that time selectmen were not chosen) were appointed by the General Court.

Now, since the settlement of Wethersfield began in the winter of 1634-5, and that of Windsor and Hartford respec-

tively in the summer and autumn following, what sort of a political organization under the name of a town could Professor Johnston have imagined the founders of Connecticut to have transported through the wilderness? A political quasi-corporation, whose organization is so imperfect that it does not choose even a constable, affords a very slim foundation for the theory that the State came into existence by assuming the exercise of powers derived from it, or rather of which it divested itself in order to endue the new sovereign with life and form; and what a meagre, helpless abortion must have been the State thus dependent for existence!

Gradually in Massachusetts, as in other colonies, new town officers were designated by the Legislature, and new powers were given to, and new duties required of them and of the town, or rather of the body of freemen in the towns. In the management of town affairs the General Court also began to remove the barriers which from 1631 had excluded all but freemen from participation in all affairs of government; and before the Colony Charter had been superseded by the Charter of William and Mary, towns had become organized substantially upon the system to which they conformed up to the time of the adoption of the State Constitution; so that we see the town was really the creature and not the parent of the General Assembly.

The so-called incorporation of Boston is contained in the following legislative *fiat* of Sept. 7, 1630: "It is ordered that Trimountaine shall be called Boston; Mattapan, Dorchester; and the towne upon Charles River, Watertown." I do not know that any one contends that this ordinance conferred any new functions on the plantations named therein, or affected their relations to the whole colony. It simply gave each of them a new name, and it was long after this before they began to exercise the powers of corporations even in the management of their internal affairs.

In like manner the date of the supersedure of Endicott's government by Winthrop, August 23, 1630,¹ would seem more properly to mark the date of incorporation of Salem than the date usually given, since the former was the date of the first appearance of separation between the general government of

¹ There is reason for believing that Winthrop's Council did not wholly supersede Endicott's, until the new board of Assistants held their first recorded meeting. See Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. iii. p. 75.

the colony and the local government of the plantation, though really no change in the management of local affairs was then effected. This was really the first act of differentiation in the process of development of the town. From the beginning the town was absolutely the creature of the State, which could at any time change its name and its boundaries, alter its constitution, or abolish it altogether by a simple act of legislation.

The support of particular ministers in the plantations or towns was at first the business of the whole corporation at home. Then the colonial assembly here began to pass ordinances from time to time for that purpose as soon as the contributions of the church members (who were the freemen) appeared too burdensome, and it was thought equitable to apportion the charge on more than one plantation, or upon persons not church members.

But, as a rule, from the first the churches supported the ministers. After a while the rates for this charge were ordered to be assessed upon the towns by the county courts. Then a similar provision was made for building dwelling-houses for the respective ministers; and finally, except in the town of Boston, the support of an "able, learned, and orthodox" ministry became a town or parish charge, and so remained through all the vicissitudes of government until, in 1833, by the adoption of Article XI. of the Amendments to the Constitution, the third article of the Declaration of Rights was so modified as to secure exemption from this burden, to all who might choose to avail themselves of that privilege; and thus, after more than two centuries, the people were for the first time freed from enforced support of public worship, and the present voluntary system began.

Again, Professor Johnston's theory as to the peculiar influence of Connecticut in shaping our Federal system seems purely imaginary. The adoption of the Federal Constitution was the establishment of a perpetual independent State or sovereignty which the exigencies of our interstate and international relations rendered indispensable. The previous confederation had not only proved insufficient, but it could no longer exist without constant danger of dissolution which would expose the several States to destruction by external enemies. This was the central and prevailing idea of the framers. The idea of

federation was not new, neither was it derived from the peculiar constitution of Connecticut or of any other colony; and nothing is clearer than that the separation of the national legislature into two chambers was but an implicit acquiescence in the course which had been adopted in the legislative system of several States. This was a feature which by a natural and gradual process had developed into greater perfection by long experience under the analogous division into Council and Representatives or Burgesses, which runs back through provincial into remote colonial times.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN then made the following remarks:—

In the early days of our colonial history burials were conducted with severe simplicity. A body was taken from the house to the grave, and interred without ceremony; and no prayer was made or other religious service held. Our pious forefathers were opposed to all ecclesiastical rites, and any custom that reminded them of the English Church met with stern disapproval. And, furthermore, prayers over a corpse were very suggestive of those offered up for the dead by the Roman Church; and to their minds such ceremonies savored strongly of heresy and superstition.

In "A Topographical and Historical Description of Boston," by our late associate, Dr. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, it is stated on page 263: "The first prayer made at a funeral in Boston is said, on good authority, to have been offered by Rev. Dr. Chauncy, at the interment of Rev. Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, pastor of the West Church, who died on the ninth of July, 1766."

More than ten years ago,¹ as will be recalled by some of the members now present, Mr. Winthrop, at that time the President of the Society, quoted with considerable incredulity the statement given above, and expressed the opinion that "in some old diary, or in some old church record, or in some old newspaper, if not on the cover of some old sermon, there would be discovered earlier dates for sermons or religious exercises of some sort at funerals." Mr. Winthrop's fore-

¹ See Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc., vol. xvii. p. 167.

sight in this matter is clearly shown by the following extract from "The Boston Weekly News-Letter," Dec. 31, 1730, which gives a much earlier date for such exercises than is mentioned by Dr. Shurtleff: —

"Yesterday were Buried here the Remains of that truly honourable & devout Gentlewoman, Mrs. SARAH BYFIELD, amidst the affectionate Respects & Lamentations of a numerous Concourse. — Before carrying out the Corpse a Funeral Prayer was made, by one of the Pastors of the *Old Church*, to whose Communion she belong'd: Which, tho' a Custom in the Country-Towns, is a singular Instance in this place, but it's wish'd may prove a leading Example to the general Practice of so christian & decent a Custom."

Dr. Green also stated that, in the absence of the Cabinet-keeper, he had received from Mr. Richard C. Humphreys, executor of the will of the late William T. Carlton, of Dorchester, the articles bequeathed to the Society by Mr. Carlton, and read a clause from the will, dated March 11, 1886, as follows: —

"*Seventeenth.* I give and bequeath to the Massachusetts Historical Society of said Boston my Halberd given to me by Saml. Blake Pierce, brother of the Rev. John Pierce, Jr., of Brookline, dec^d. The Sen. John was accustomed to carry said Halberd officially on 'training days'; it has been but a few rods from where I am now writing (my residence) for more than One hundred (100) years, and there can be no doubt of its authenticity; I also give to said Society a small pocket compass owned and carried by the old surveyor Blake of said Dorchester dist^t."

Mr. HENRY W. HAYNES read a paper as follows on

The Historical Character of the Norse Sagas.

The subject of the erection of a statue in this city to Leif, the son of Erik, as the discoverer of America, has twice been made the occasion of comments before this Society within a few years.¹ I should not therefore have referred again to so trite an affair, if the motives that inspired such comments on our part had not recently been made the occasion of such remarkable criticism as I do not remember to have ever seen passed upon any body of men whose function it is to discover and to record the truths of history.

¹ Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc., vol. xviii. p. 79; 2d series, vol. iv. pp. 12, 42.

Rev. Dr. B. F. De Costa has just published a second edition of a work entitled "The Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen." In that portion of his general introduction designated "The Present State of the Discussion," he has seen fit to quote certain words used by me in stating the conclusions reached by a committee appointed by this Society "to consider the question of the alleged discovery of America by the Norsemen." My language was: "There is the same sort of reason for believing in the existence of Leif Ericson that there is for believing in the existence of Agamemnon; they are both traditions accepted by later writers." Dr. De Costa goes on to remark upon this, that "it is sufficiently evident that local feeling, which often vitiates the studies of the most accomplished men, enters into this singular declaration. It serves no special purpose beyond proving a feeling of irritation on the part of men accustomed to have every utterance received with deference, but who have discovered a certain inability to control public opinion in connection with historical monuments. The people have moved on and left them behind" (pp. 58, 59).

Now, as I wrote the offensive paragraph I must beg leave to disclaim personally any "feeling of irritation," as well as to deny "the soft impeachment" of being "accustomed to have [my] every utterance received with deference." I can assure my critic I have found the contrary quite as likely to happen. As I read this charitable imputing of motives, I could not help wondering why the advocacy of the discovery of America by the Norsemen should generate such an excess of heat as it does in certain quarters. I was entirely innocent of any intentional disrespect when I ventured upon the unlucky comparison of Leif Ericson with Agamemnon. All my life long I have been a believer in the existence of Agamemnon, and I have even felt a good deal of admiration for "the king of men, the godlike son of Atreus." But I seem to have done something wrong, for in the judgment of my critic "the notion that any one of these Icelandic characters is to be viewed as mythical or in the category with that of 'Agamemnon' appears simply preposterous" (p. 151). However, as I turned the pages I found I was not the only one who has fallen under the reverend gentleman's condemnation, for I read: "This is another passage upon which Bancroft *absurdly* depended to

prove that the locality of Vinland was unknown" (p. 185). *Bona verba quæso!* I suppose I must endeavor to put up with being called *preposterous*, when the veteran historian of the United States is written down as *absurd*.

We are informed in Dr. De Costa's preface that the work was prepared more than twenty years ago, and that "time has only served to strengthen his belief in the historical character of the Sagas" (p. 6). I cannot help wondering whether the learned author has ever heard, during all this long period, of the new science of prehistoric archæology, which has come to be recognized as having somewhat to say upon precisely such a question as whether there is any actual proof that the statements in the Sagas that the Norsemen discovered America possess any historical character whatsoever, or whether they only afford a presumption of such discovery; whether, in fact, any archæological evidence *has ever been discovered* to confirm the truth of the details regarding such alleged discovery as are found in the Sagas. It seems somewhat strange for such an argument as the following to make its appearance at this day in what purports to be serious historical discussion: "It is not improbable that such remains *may yet be discovered* on Mount Hope Bay, or in regions on the Massachusetts and Maine coasts" (p. 148). One would suppose the neighborhood of Newport and Bar Harbor to be a sort of *terra incognita*, if he did not know that our learned author once compiled a guide-book to the latter unexplored country. But I find even more about the supposititious kind of evidence looked for: "We have a right to expect some relic, a coin or amulet, perhaps, that *chance may yet throw* in the antiquary's way; or some excavation, it may be a trench, conduit, cellar, or incipient fortress" (pp. 70, 71). Evidently our author has no faith in the neighboring city of Norumbega, although he refers elsewhere, apparently with approval, to the ancient fish-pits discovered by Professor Horsford on the banks of Charles River (p. 128). But in all soberness we would ask what sort of reasoning is this which argues not from what *has been*, but what *may be* discovered?

It is plain that Dr. De Costa feels the need of some archæological evidence to reinforce the poetical fictions of the Sagas, for he rehashes the exploded tales about "Dighton Rock" and "The Old Stone Mill at Newport." Of the one he says, "The

old rock is a riddle"; and of the other, "That structure [that is, the mill at Chesterton, in England, the prototype of the one at Newport] also might have belonged to the class of towers of which one at least was built by Northmen in Greenland. All is, therefore, in a measure, doubtful." It is true he professes not to attach great importance to these as pieces of evidence; but why then devote five long pages to discussing them? Is it because he desires to befog his readers; or is he unable to comprehend the point at issue, and understand what is meant by the weight of evidence and the sufficiency of proof? He would seem to belong to the class of writers by whom *numérantur sententiæ, non ponderantur*, when we find him gravely referring to Abner Morse's "Traces of the Northmen in America" (p. 71). In the judgment of Dr. De Costa, "marvellous statements and occasional contradictions *in nowise detract from the historic value of the documents themselves*" (p. 64). Accordingly, he explains away the familiar story about Tyrker, the foster-father of Leif, having found grapes in Mount Hope Bay, upon which he became "quite merry," in the following literal fashion: "There is nothing in this to indicate that Tyrker was intoxicated, as some have absurdly supposed. In this far-off land he found grapes, which powerfully reminded him of his native country, and the association of ideas is so strong that when he first meets Leif, he breaks out in the language of his childhood, and, like ordinary epicures, expresses his joy" (p. 102). After such a piece of special pleading as this we are quite prepared to find our learned author standing up stoutly for the Uniped, in such words as these: "We do not say how far the Saga-writer employs his fancy on the Uniped, yet he is quite excusable, considering the weakness of modern writers" (p. 133). There is an old maxim often quoted in regard to witnesses to matters of fact, *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*; but evidently this would not give Dr. De Costa any trouble.

I will quote a few of the additions to knowledge with which he has enriched his latest notes, premising with the statement that he appears to have given ready acceptance to Du Chail-lu's theory about what he calls "the Viking Age," and the pretended Scandinavian origin of the English, with which Freeman has made such effectual and amusing work in the last number of the "Contemporary Review." Dr. De Costa is pleased to prepare us for what is to come by the information

that "in reality we fable in a great measure when we speak of our 'Saxon inheritance.' It is rather from the Northmen that we have derived our vital energy, our freedom of thought, and, in a measure that we do not suspect, our strength of speech" (p. 8). Let me begin with his instruction in geology. It seems that critics have cavilled at certain statements to be found in the Sagas, that their heroes were mounted on horseback in Greenland. In reply our author first puts in pleas in abatement,—that in "modern times there has been nothing to prevent the people from keeping such animals" (p. 91); or "they probably had at least diminutive horses, or ponies, in Greenland, like those of Iceland to-day" (p. 113). But apparently these do not quite satisfy him, for he goes on to enlarge in this wise: "Horses could be kept in Greenland now, only with much expense. It appears that anciently it was not so. Undoubtedly there has been more or less of change in climate during the last thousand years by the procession of the equinox. Geologists find evidence that at one period a highly tropical climate must have existed in the northern regions" (p. 93). This is the only time I have ever seen geological evidence of the climate in the tertiary ages invoked to substantiate an alleged change of climate within the comparative yesterday of a thousand years ago, except by our author in a subsequent passage. There is a statement in one of the Sagas that certain persons "saw a great number of men riding toward them"; upon which Dr. De Costa has this comment: "The language may indicate that they were horseback, though it is not conclusive. At the period referred to there may have been no horses in America. They were introduced by the Spaniards after the discovery by Columbus. At least, such is the common opinion. This statement is made without reference to the proofs offered of the existence of the horse at an earlier period, the remains of which are said to be found" (p. 175). Unless Dr. De Costa means to imply by this the possibility that tertiary animals may have been in existence at the time of the Sagas, we are at a loss to understand why he should have made any reference at all to them; and we wonder whether he imagines that the Scandinavian or Irish heroes may have been after all riding upon bisons. But natural history does not seem to be our author's strong point. He makes the assertion that "only

two quadrupeds, the fox and the moose, are indigenous" in Iceland (p. 20); whereas the fact is that there are no moose in Iceland at all, and the reindeer has only been introduced from Norway within about a hundred years. In his botany also he seems to be equally out of the way, for he quotes with approval the remarkable statement that "at Pittston, Me., trees three feet in diameter and with six hundred annular rings were found associated with brick-work which, so far as appearances went, antedated the trees" (p. 71). I think a botanist would have told him that the rings are not a safe criterion by which to determine the age of trees, and that the trees of Maine, such as the pine and the spruce, do not live to the age of six hundred years. I find another remarkable statement of our author, that "the self-sown wheat," or "corn," often mentioned in the Sagas as having been met with in Vinland, does not mean *Indian corn*, or *maize* (p. 123). But it is perfectly well known that *wheat* is not indigenous in America; and if there is any truth at all in such stories, nothing but maize could have been intended. Upon another vexed problem in botany, raised by the Sagas, he differs entirely from the leading champion of Leif's discovery in this community. I refer to the often quoted *husa-snotru*, made of *massur-wood*. Dr. De Costa thinks that it was "a bar for securing the house-door" (p. 155); but Professor Horsford glories in his discovery that the word signifies "house-scales," and that "*mösur-wood*" means the burrs or excrescences occasionally found growing upon certain trees, and he bursts out in the exultant pæan, "I have not only reached the heart of the problem, but I can feel its beat."¹

I have, however, reserved for the last Dr. De Costa's most startling discovery, which is nothing less than that "we have in the Sagas four words which may be the oldest known words of human speech," or as he supposes, the speech of the glacial man. To substantiate this notion he quotes from a private note of Prof. Max Müller: "There is nothing in the language of the Esquimaux to prevent us from assigning it to an antiquity as high as that of the supposed glacial man" (p. 135). Now, as some very learned and distinguished anthro-

¹ The Discovery of the Ancient City of Norumbega, by Eben Norton Horsford, p. 24.

pologists have endeavored to demonstrate from certain anatomical peculiarities in the oldest known type of human skull that the glacial man had not developed the organs of speech, we are naturally led to scrutinize closely the grounds upon which Dr. De Costa bases his grand discovery. According to the story in the Sagas, Thorwald, Leif's brother, and his party had an encounter with some Skraellings, who killed Thorwald with their arrows. Dr. De Costa argues that this people were Esquimaux and not Indians, because "Abbott's researches show, beyond question, that the Indian was preceded by a people like the Esquimaux, whose stone implements are found in the Trenton gravel" (p. 132); and that inasmuch as "the Skraellings were still in the stone age" they must be regarded as the descendants of that glacial man whose stone implements have been found by Dr. Abbott. Now, as Dr. Abbott's conclusions are disputed by many prehistoric archæologists who find no proof whatever of the Esquimaux having been descended from the race whose palæolithic implements are found in the gravels at Trenton, and as every one knows that the Indians used stone arrow-points when first discovered by Europeans, even if we admit the truth of the story that the Northmen actually had such an encounter, there is nothing to show that the Skraellings differed in respect to their weapons from other natives; much less that they were the representatives of the glacial man, who, if he lived at all, it is agreed must have lived many thousand years ago, and who is not believed to have been sufficiently advanced to have invented so complicated an implement as the bow and arrow. Yet such flimsy arguments as these, grounded only upon an unproved supposition of Dr. Abbott, are sufficient for Dr. De Costa to lay claim to the most wonderful discovery in philology of our day.

But while thus taking exception to Dr. De Costa's excursions into the domain of science, I do not feel quite satisfied with his conclusions in his chosen field of history. In fact I feel somewhat inclined to question whether he can have actually studied the authorities he purports to quote, when I find him asserting that Olaus Magnus — archbishop of Upsala, in Sweden, and a well-known antiquary, whose "*Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus*" was published in 1555, — "wrote in 1075" (p. 104); or when I notice that he says of the two

well-known examples of Viking vessels that have been discovered in burial-mounds in Norway, where they had been used as coffins for the chieftains over whom the mound had been heaped, that "they were scuttled and sunk. The changes in the coast finally left them imbedded in the sand" (p. 38). Then he makes the assertion that Runes existed among the Northmen in the seventh century (*Ibid.*); while Prof. George Stephens, of Copenhagen, the recognized authority upon Runic inscriptions, has shown that the oldest written Icelandic dates from about A. D. 1200. But of all the remarkable statements to be found within the compass of Dr. De Costa's little volume, the following is the most novel: "The Irish, doubtless, mingled with the Carthaginians in mercantile transactions, and from them they not unlikely received the rites of Druidism" (p. 17). It certainly will astonish ethnologists to be informed of this wonderful transmission of a Celtic institution through a Semitic source.

These will be, I think, quite sufficient examples of the manner in which "the truths divine" of the Sagas have "come mended from the pen" of Rev. Dr. De Costa. If he had not stopped short in his quotation of my language, and had added what immediately follows, "There is no more reason for regarding as true the details related about Leif's discoveries than there is for accepting as historic truths the narratives contained in the Homeric poems," I should have had more reason for understanding the motive of his assault upon the report made to this Society. The little clique devoted to the cult of *The Norse Discovery of America*, which they are striving by every means, legitimate or otherwise, to impose upon the minds of the rising generation, on the ground that "Boston is a singularly appropriate place for a monument to the Northmen" (p. 109), cannot forget or forgive the sober, weighty words with which our late lamented member Dr. Deane expressed what I believe to be the judgment of this Society upon the question of *the historical character of the Norse Sagas*: "It might, perhaps, be over-bold to contend that these half-poetical recitations of a story-teller are fictions, like the poems of Ossian; yet to elevate them to the dignity of historical relations in all their details, and to place implicit reliance on the data given as to time and place, seem to me unwarrant-

able. They are shadowy and mythical in form, and often uncertain in meaning."¹

Mr. Edwin Lassetter Bynner was elected a Resident Member.

A new serial containing the proceedings at the Special Meeting in commemoration of our late associate, Charles Deane, LL.D., and at the regular meetings in December and January, was ready for distribution at this meeting.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN, in behalf of Mr. AUGUSTUS T. PERKINS, who was absent, communicated a memoir of the late Thomas Coffin Amory.

¹ Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc., vol. xviii. p. 81.

MEMOIR
OF
THOMAS COFFIN AMORY, A.M.

BY AUGUSTUS T. PERKINS.

MR. THOMAS COFFIN AMORY, a counsellor-at-law, and a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, came from a family very well known in Ireland as the Amorys of Bunratty, whose records extend far into the past. For our present purpose, however, we need go no farther back than to the father of the emigrant, thereby establishing a point difficult to fix in many American families.

Thomas Amory, the ancestor of whom we speak, was born in Limerick in Ireland in the year 1682. He was taken by his father, Jonathan Amory, first to Antigua, and thence to Charleston, South Carolina. He was sent back to be educated in England, and was put under the care of his cousin Thomas Amory of Bunratty. He returned in 1719 to Boston, and there married Rebeckah Holmes in 1721, and died in 1728.

He came from a younger branch of the family of Amory of Bunratty, whose principal seat was the fine old castle of that name, which, although built in the time of Henry VIII., is still standing in good preservation, on the west side of the river Shannon, at the end of the bridge leading to Limerick, that city being only a few miles away.

There was to be seen in the year 1865, in a small room in the lower part of Bunratty Castle, the arms of the family done in stucco. Although much defaced, the coat was still discernible, showing a Barry of six; on a chief of the first, a Lion passant. No crest was visible at that time.

Thomas Amory (2), son of Thomas (1) and Rebeckah Holmes, was born in Boston in 1722. He graduated from

Harvard College in the class of 1741. He married Elizabeth, daughter of William Coffin, and died in 1784.

Jonathan Amory, son of Thomas (2) and Elizabeth Coffin, was born in Boston in 1770. He married Mehitable Sullivan, daughter of Gov. James Sullivan, and died in 1828.

Thomas Coffin Amory, son of Jonathan and Mehitable Sullivan, was born in Boston Oct. 16, 1812, in his father's fine old mansion, still standing on the corner of Park and Beacon Streets; and he continued to reside there with his family, until the year 1835, when they removed first to Temple Place, and finally to Commonwealth Avenue, where he died August 20, 1889.

The homes of his childhood were certainly luxurious; and his summers were passed either at his father's place at Nahant or at Brookline, or on the beautiful estate of Mr. Nathaniel Amory in that part of Watertown which is now included in Belmont, lately the residence of Mr. John Perkins Cushing.

At the age of ten years he was sent to the famous school at Round Hill, Northampton, then under the care of the learned Dr. Cogswell; and there he remained until he was fourteen years of age. Thence he returned to his father's house in Park Street, where he was prepared for Harvard College by those two most accomplished gentlemen, Charles Chauncy Emerson and Louis Stackpole; and he graduated from Cambridge in the class of 1830.

About this time, in the company of our formerly well-known member, Mr. Francis C. Gray, he made his first visit to England, where, from their excellent letters of introduction, they had the pleasure of visiting Wordsworth, Southey, and Sir Walter Scott in their own homes,—always delightful reminiscences to the young Bostonian.

Upon his return from Europe, he began the study of the law, under his uncle the Hon. William Sullivan, and joined with him in the care of the property of the family; and his journals at this time show how much interest he had in his profession, in society, in general literature, and to a certain extent in the politics of the day. He was in Washington at the time of the inauguration of President Van Buren.

In 1843 he made a voyage to Cuba, returning by the way

of Charleston, South Carolina, where he had the pleasure of meeting some of his distant relatives, who treated him most courteously.

In 1832, finding among his father's papers certain old wills and letters giving almost all the facts of the emigration of his ancestor to this country, he began to take that especial interest in his family history which ever retained so strong a hold upon him.

In the year 1853, in company with his two sisters, he made a second visit to Europe. I had the good fortune to be a fellow-passenger with them, and his sisters were delightful companions. There were on board with us Mr. William Appleton, Jr., Mr. Charles Thorndike, and Mr. Charles H. Appleton, also my friend Mr. William Amory Prescott. The steamer was the "America," Captain Lang, of twelve hundred tons' burden, then considered a vessel of wonderful size. There were also a number of English army officers on board, together with a very clever Fellow of Oxford, a Mr. Turner, whom I made a friend of by presenting him, at the end of the voyage, with my copy of the poems of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, — a gentleman of whom he had never heard before, but whom he afterward very much admired.

One day Mr. Amory and this Mr. Turner entered into a discussion on our Revolutionary War, of which Mr. Turner knew somewhat. The English officers — all well-educated men, but quite ignorant of the history of that war — gathered about, evidently anxious to learn. Mr. Amory was then about forty years of age, quick and alert. He answered all questions and cross-questions with such promptitude and good temper, and delivered to us so interesting a lecture on the outbreak of the Revolution, that all present were greatly interested; and at the request of the English officers he continued from time to time to instruct us, so that by the end of our pleasant voyage of twelve days we all felt and said that it was good fortune to have been thrown into the society of so able and so agreeable a gentleman. The Englishmen were evidently surprised at his knowledge of his subject, and his tact in handling it.

It must have been before this, however, that he had studied hard on the biography of his grandfather, a very noted man in his time, the Hon. James Sullivan. This work was published

in the year 1858, and Mr. Amory was thereupon elected a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

In the same year he was chosen an Alderman of the city of Boston ; and in the year 1859 he was elected a member of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts. In a very well considered article on Mr. Amory, the author of which I cannot discover, the writer says : "During the war he rendered magnificent service to the city in his position on the Board of Aldermen." He gave great assistance in the building of our City Hospital. He was President of its first Board of Trustees, and he delivered the oration at its dedication. He was strenuous in his endeavors to oblige the City of Boston to purchase the ferries ; and this he finally accomplished. His reports on county relations, ordinances, primary meetings, weights and measures, street widening, city charities, State aid to volunteers, the police force, and the methods of supplying soldiers for Massachusetts were published, and remain a monument to his love for the honor of our city and of our State.

The prompt and determined action of Mr. Amory during the draft riots of the year 1863 did much toward quelling the turbulence of the mob. Indeed he risked his life in order to prevent an outbreak, for which he was violently assaulted. His admirable physical courage stood him in good stead on this trying occasion, and he escaped without serious injury.

He took great interest in the erection of the Charity Building in Chardon Street, and rendered all possible assistance in thus enlarging the usefulness of an admirable department of our City Government.

As a student of history he was unwearied, and spared neither pains nor hard work in his efforts to publish the truth as he saw it.

His family for generations in this town have produced men well known for honor, probity, courage, and good conduct, as well as for unusually sound judgment in the affairs of life ; and I think those who knew Mr. Thomas Coffin Amory well, will acknowledge that he was inferior to none of his kin in any respect. Without possessing the remarkable elegance of deportment and charm of manner which was so marked a characteristic of his elder brother, Mr. James Sullivan Amory, he still had about him all the signs of a well-bred man of the

world, — self-poised and confident, wherever he was. No one who ever met him could mistake him for anything but a well-read, well-nurtured gentleman, with just a lingering suggestion of what is now called old times about him, not unpleasant to many of those of a younger generation.

He took great interest in all that was connected with our Trinity Church, and as an officer and a member gave of his time and means with the greatest liberality.

To sum up the character of Mr. Amory, I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that he was a brave, honest, liberal, patriotic, well-educated Christian gentleman; and can we say anything much better of any man?

Mr. Amory's publications are: —

The Life of James Sullivan, with Selections from his Writings. Boston, 1859.

The Military Services and Public Life of Maj.-Gen. John Sullivan of the American Revolutionary Army. Albany and Boston, 1868.

The Transfer of Erin, or the Acquisition of Ireland by England. Philadelphia, 1877.

The Life of Admiral Coffin. Boston, 1886.

The Siege of Newport. Cambridge, 1888.

Charles River: A Poem. Cambridge, 1888.

Miscellaneous Poems. Cambridge, 1888.

Also the following pamphlets: —

Gen. John Sullivan: A Vindication of his Character as a Soldier and a Patriot. From the Historical Magazine for December, 1866. Morrisania, N. Y., 1867.

The Military Services of Maj.-Gen. John Sullivan in the American Revolution vindicated from recent Historical Criticism. Read at a meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, December, 1866. With additions and documents. Cambridge, 1868.

Master Sullivan of Berwick, his Ancestors and Descendants. No date.

Old Cambridge and New. Reprinted from the New England Historical and Genealogical Register for July, 1871. With additions. Boston, 1871.

Our English Ancestors. Boston, 1872.

A Home of the Olden Time. Boston, 1872.

General Sullivan not a Pensioner of Luzerne (Minister of France at Philadelphia, 1778-1783). With the Report of the New Hampshire Historical Society vindicating him from the charge made.

Blackstone, Boston's first Inhabitant. Boston, 1877.

Memoir of John Wingate Thornton, A. M., LL.B., with a list of his publications. Printed for private distribution. Boston, 1879.

Memoir of Hon. William Sullivan, prepared for early diary of Massachusetts Historical Proceedings. Cambridge, 1879.

Centennial Memoir of Maj.-Gen. John Sullivan, 1740-1795, presented at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, July 2, 1876. Reprinted from the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. Philadelphia, 1879.

Was Gov. John Leverett a Knight? Reprint from the New England Historical and Genealogical Register for July and October, 1881. Boston, 1881.

The Siege of Newport, August, 1778. Reprinted from the Rhode Island Historical Magazine for October, 1884. Newport, 1884.

Daniel Sullivan's Visits, May and June, 1771, to Gen. John Sullivan. Reprinted from a paper read to the Massachusetts Historical Society, March, 1884. With additional comments. Cambridge, 1884.

Memoir of Hon. Richard Sullivan. Reprinted from Vol. IV. of the Memorial Biographies of the New England Historic Genealogical Society. Cambridge, 1885.

William Blaxton. Collections of the Bostonian Society, Vol. I. No. 1. Boston, 1886.

Class Memoir of George Washington Warren, with English and American Ancestry, together with Letters, Valedictory Poem, Ode, etc. Boston, 1886.

Address at the Dedication of the City Hospital. (City Document.) Boston, 1865.

Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston, 1867. (City Document.) Boston, 1868.

Also a paper on the Amory Family in the New England Genealogical and Historical Register, 1856.